Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 28 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. 85-1299

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

JAMES LAURENT, Youth Supervisor II, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

JEFFREY WATTS,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

NEIL F. HARTIGAN
Attorney General, State of Illinois
ROMA JONES STEWART
Solicitor General, State of Illinois
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-3000
Attorneys for Petitioners

PATRICIA ROSEN *
Assistant Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-2570
* Counsel of Record

Printed by Authority of the State of Illinois (P.O. 33099—55—1-27-86)

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Seventh Circuit's decision sanctioning the imposition of Eighth Amendment liability in this case offends traditional principles of federalism by impinging upon the wide-ranging deference which should be accorded to state prison officials by the federal courts and improperly authorizes Eighth Amendment recoveries for isolated violent incidents occurring in state prisons.

LIST OF PARTIES

The following is a list of all parties involved in this application for a Writ of Certiorari.

A. PETITIONERS:

1. James Laurent, Youth Supervisor II
2. Geri A. Cejka, Youth Supervisor II
3. Althea Brown, Youth Supervisor II
4. Steven Van Joske, Youth Supervisor II

B. RESPONDENT:

Jeffrey Watts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE(S)
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
LIST OF PARTIES	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
REASONS FOR ALLOWING THE WRIT:	
CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO REVERSE THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION, WHICH AFFIRMED THE IMPOSITION OF EIGHTH AMENDMENT LIABILITY UPON STATE PRISON OFFICIALS FOR AN ISOLATED VIOLENT INCIDENT	13
CONCLUSION	23

APPENDIX
(Separate Volume)

	APP. PAGE
Opinion of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals	1
Opinion of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division	26
Opinion of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in *Duckworth v. Franzen*, Nos. 85-1010, 85-1053, 85-1084, 85-1095, Dec. 17, 1985	45
Order of the United States Court of Appeals Denying Rehearing	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	PAGE(S)
Battle v. Anderson, 564 F.2d 388 (10th Cir. 1977) .	18
Branchcomb v. Brewer, 669 F.2d 1297 (8th Cir. 1982)	14
Clark v. Taylor, 710 F.2d 4 (1st Cir. 1983) ...	14
Daniels v. Williams, ___ U.S. ___, 46 CCH Sup. Ct. Bull. 609 (1986)	21, 23
Davidson v. Cannon, ___ U.S. ___, 46 CCH Sup. Ct. Bull. 627 (1986)	21, 22, 23
Estate of Davis v. Johnson, 745 F.2d 1066 (7th Cir. 1984)	15
Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1967)	13
Fleishour v. United States, 244 F. Supp. 762 (N.D. Ill. 1965), *aff'd*, 365 F.2d 126 (7th Cir.), *cert. den.*, 385 U.S. 987 (1966)	17
Hampton v. Holmesburg Prison Officials, 546 F.2d 1077 (3d Cir. 1976)	19
Hewitt v. Helms, 459 U.S. 460 (1983)	16
Hite v. Leeke, 564 F.2d 670 (4th Cir. 1977) ...	19
Hudson v. Palmer, ___ U.S. ___, 104 S. Ct. 3194 (1984)	16
Jones v. Diamond, 594 F.2d 997 (5th Cir. 1979) ..	19
Jones v. United States, 534 F.2d 53 (5th Cir.), *cert. den.*, 429 U.S. 978 (1976)	14, 15
Little v. Walker, 552 F.2d 193 (7th Cir. 1977), *cert. den.*, 435 U.S. 932 (1978)	14, 15

McKenna v. County of Nassau, 538 F. Supp. 737 (E.D.N.Y.), *aff'd*, 714 F.2d 115 (2d Cir. 1982) .. 15

Miller v. Solem, 728 F.2d 1020 (8th Cir.), *cert. den.*, 105 S. Ct. 145 (1984) 14

O'Neal v. Evans, 496 F. Supp. 867 (S.D. Ga. 1980) .. 19

Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527 (1981) 15

Patzig v. O'Neal, 577 F.2d 841 (3d Cir. 1978) 15

Penn v. Oliver, 351 F. Supp. 1292 (E.D. Va. 1972) .. 19

Procunier v. Martinez, 416 U.S. 396 (1974) 18

Ramos v. Lamm, 639 F.2d 559 (10th Cir. 1980) .. 14

Rhodes v. Chapman, 452 U.S. 337 (1981) 13, 14

Ruiz v. Estelle, 679 F.2d 1115 (5th Cir.), *amended in part*, 688 F.2d 266 (5th Cir. 1982), *cert. den.*, 460 U.S. 1042 (1983) 14

Schall v. Rowe, 460 F. Supp. 155 (S.D. Ill. 1978) . 19

State Bank of St. Charles v. Camic, 712 F.2d 1140 (7th Cir. 1983) 15

United States ex rel. Miller v. Twomey, 479 F.2d 701 (7th Cir. 1973), *cert. den.*, 414 U.S. 1146 (1974) 15

Williams v. Field, 416 F.2d 483 (9th Cir. 1969) ... 19

Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539 (1974) 16

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 2

42 U.S.C. § 1983 ..... *passim*

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1985

JAMES LAURENT, Youth Supervisor II, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

JEFFREY WATTS,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals is reported at 777 F.2d 1258 and is reproduced in the Appendix at App. 1-25. The judgment of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois is not reported and is reproduced in the Appendix at App. 26-44.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was entered on September 18, 1985. Defendants obtained an extension of time in order to file a petition for rehearing with suggestion for rehearing *in banc*, which was timely filed on October 10, 1985. A cross-petition for rehearing was also filed by plaintiff. Both petitions were denied on November 1, 1985. (App. 64) This petition for a Writ of Certiorari is timely filed within 90 days of that date. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Plaintiff, Jeffrey Watts, a resident at the Illinois Youth Correctional Center at St. Charles, brought a civil rights suit against several employees at the St. Charles facility, including James Laurent, Geri A. Cejka, Barbara Fredrickson, Barry Steele, Althea Brown and Steven Van Joske. Plaintiff sought to recover damages for a hip injury he received in an incident occurring on January 22, 1982. If viewed in the light most favorable to plaintiff, the evidence adduced at trial in this case was as follows.

The Facility

St. Charles is a medium-to-maximum security institution (STEELE Tr. 357) housing in excess of three hundred male juvenile offenders (WATTS Tr. 67; STEELE Tr. 359) ranging in age from 13½ to 20½. (STEELE Tr. 359). These

boys are housed in separate cottages, each cottage holding about 24 boys. (STEELE Tr. 359). Plaintiff estimated that there were between 11-14 cottages and about a hundred staff persons working at St. Charles at the time of this incident (a staff/offender ratio of 1:3). (WATTS Tr. 68).

With respect to the typical behavior of the residents of the St. Charles facility, it was undisputed that "tough talk" and arguments between the students were commonplace. For example, Mr. Laurent testified that "they all talk tough" (Tr. 340) and "all the kids argue" (Tr. 430, 435). When he was asked whether they ever threatened one another, he responded: "Yes, they would talk about they were going to knock each other in the head and stuff like that." (Tr. 345).

Mr. Van Joske also testified that all of the residents got into fights and arguments and emphasized that he could not think of one student at St. Charles who hadn't gotten into a fight or argument. (Tr. 252, 256-57). Where students engaged in improper behavior, if the infraction was minor, they might be sent to their rooms to "cool off" or they might be given a BAT ticket ("behavior action ticket"); if the infraction was major then a disciplinary report would be written and the resident would be removed from the cottage and sent to Roosevelt. (CEJKA Tr. 217). With respect to fights and threats, Mr. Laurent testified "If they don't stop the argument, they either go in their room and cool off or they have to be wrote up and sent out [to Roosevelt]. Anything I couldn't control, I sent them off to Roosevelt." (Tr. 345).

The Plaintiff

Plaintiff Watts was convicted of a crime and was sent to St. Charles on July 21, 1981. He was a resident at St. Charles for about two years. (WATTS Tr. 67). He had no

complaints in general about the staff at the facility; in fact, he stated that he had a good relationship with most of them: "Well, I was, you know—some of them I got along good with, real good and some of them, you know, we had a few difficulties at times, but pretty much very good." *Id.*

He did not explain in great detail his relationship with the other residents at St. Charles, but he did state that on more than a few occasions several of them attempted to recruit him for one of the gangs there. (Tr. 70-72). He said that he refused to become a member of a gang and he was later asked "And after you said no, nobody harmed you?" He responded "Well, I had a couple fights with a few of them, but you know, I guess that was it." (Tr. 116). Plaintiff also testified as to other fights which he had had at St. Charles in the following exchange:

> Q. Now, you knew that you had to be careful—you said that you had to watch your back against Derrick Greaves, is that correct?
> A. Along with other students, yes.
>
> Q. So he wasn't the only student you had to watch your back against?
> A. I didn't hardly trust too many other students because I seen that a lot of students were fighting. I fought a lot of students, you know. You just can't trust everybody.
>
> Q. Because a lot of kids are tough there?
> A. Yes.

Tr. at 127-28.

The Threats

Plaintiff testified that about three weeks prior to January 22nd he was inside Pierce cottage recreation room at about 5:50 or 6:00 p.m. and was playing cards with

Derrick Greaves, Carmello Santiago, Carlos Rivera and Toronto Brooks (Tr. 74-75) when the following exchange took place.

> Well, he [Derrick] got mad and, you know, he had jumped up and said something about, "You cheating," like that, and I told him, "I'm not cheating. You can go back through the books and look." He talked about that he was going to kick my ass if he found out I was cheating, and I told him, "I'm not accepting no ass-whipping by you or anybody else," that I wasn't cheating, and then he stated that I'm lucky that I'm shorty and that one day he is going to excuse that by me being a shorty, that he is going to fight me or whatever.

Tr. at 76.

The second incident also occurred some time prior to January 22nd, but plaintiff was not sure of the date. On this occasion the whole cottage was present because they were lining up to go to breakfast. (Tr. 77). Plaintiff explained:

> Well, anyway, see, we all, you know, everybody wants to be first in line to eat first, I guess, and it happened in the morning on the way to breakfast, and I was in front of the line, so he [Derrick] wanted to be in front, so he got in front of me. So, you know, I was saying, "Like you just can't walk in front of me." So I walked back in front of him. We kept on doing that for a few minutes and then he stated that he runs the line, he goes first and I said, "you don't go first because I got here before you." And then he said that he goes first because this is his cottage, he run this cottage, and I told him, "You might run them, but I'm not going to let you run over me." And then he said again, he stated that, "You're lucky you're a shorty and one day you're going to get yours."

Tr. 78.

The next incident was about a month prior to January 22nd inside Pierce Cottage between 7:00 and 8:00 p.m. and was an argument "over a pool game." Tr. 78-79.

> He [Derrick] had grabbed a ball and tried to cheat me. It was my shot. He thought I didn't see it. He tried to put it inside the pocket and I told him, "I seen what you did. Pull the ball out and put it back on the table."
>
> He got loud and was saying, "I didn't move the ball." I said, "I seen you move the ball. Just put it back." And then he came up in front of me. He said, "I didn't move the ball." I said, "I seen you."
>
> I grabbed the pool ball and put it back in its place where it belonged. He came over to me. He snatched the ball like that and he put it back in the pocket. I grabbed his hand and moved all the balls. I said "Well, that's your game, so let somebody else play. Who is next," like that, and then he came up on me. He said, "I'm going to smash you, punk, you keep on bothering me. You keep on getting on my nerves, I'm going to smash you."
>
> I said, "Hey, you know you cheated, so get up and let the next person play." He was in my face and me and him was exchanging words, and I don't know exactly which words they were, but, you know, we were exchanging words and other students came in between us and pulled us apart and we were sent to our room for room time.

Tr. 79-80.

The final incident also took place "about a month before"* January 22nd outside the old dining room. Tr. 80. Plaintiff explained this incident as follows:

---

* The timing of this incident is inconsistent with the weather described. *See also* Tr. 124-27. However, to avoid any credibility issues, defendants relate the issue just as the plaintiff explained it.

> Well, I remember he [Derrick] came to me because, you know, it was nice outside, it was in the afternoon. It was nice and we were like on the grass by the dining room. Everybody was talking and standing around. A few people were playing, wrestling and all that. And I was talking to one of the students from Cleveland Cottage, James Brown. I think that was his name. And Derrick Greaves didn't like James Brown, so he came over there, you know, and he said, you know, "What's up? I heard you all talking about me," and James Brown looked at him and I said, "we're not talking about you," like that. So then him and James Brown, they didn't like each other, so then they got to looking at each other hard and then the people—* * *
>
> Well, then the staff from Cleveland Cottage—that's the cottage that Brown belonged to, called Brown over to the cottage because they seen them arguing and when he went over there Derrick Greaves was saying stuff like, "you're talking about me, punk. I don't like nobody talking about me if you got anything to say about me, say it in my face."
>
> I said, "If I have something to say about you, I'll say it in your face, but we wasn't talking about you." And then he kept on saying stuff like, "Well, let me find you talking about me," and stuff like that and I was steady telling him that I wasn't talking about him and then he like, he was going like this and making faces at me, like that. So I just looked at him and told him, "Go on, get out of my face. It wasn't about you." And he was mumbling words like, "Boy, one day," stuff like that.

Tr. 81. Plaintiff did not recall any other threats by Derrick Greaves to him. *Ibid.* When he was asked whether he was afraid of Derrick Greaves, he said "I wasn't afraid of fighting him, but I knew I had to watch my back against him." Tr. 116.

The Attack

The plaintiff's injury occurred on January 22, 1982, shortly after lunch. Tr. 94-95. It was cold and snowing. All of the students lined up outside to walk back to the cottage. The students requested permission to take a short-cut across a field. Tr. 95-96. Plaintiff described the incident as follows:

> Well, the staff members got the [head] count and me along with other students asked Mrs. Brown and Mr. Steven Van Joske can we run—can we cut across the field and she said yea, so almost a majority—everybody started running. I was running to get back to the cottage, and then the next thing I know, Derrick Greaves came behind me and tackled me with a bear hug and fell on top of me. When he got up, he growled and then he walked away like he had done something big.

Tr. 96-97. Derrick Greaves did not hit plaintiff while he was on the ground; Derrick got right up "and growled," then walked away. Tr. 136. When plaintiff was asked whether Derrick came back to see how he was he responded "I think he came back because he was more scared than I was because he knew he had hurt me." *Ibid.* The defendants' failure to guard plaintiff in order to prevent this attack was the basis for their liability under the Eighth Amendment in this case. It was undisputed that plaintiff never asked defendants for protection from Derrick Greaves. Tr. 129-32.* Throughout his trial, plaintiff contended that the defendants knew that Derrick Greaves posed a physical threat to him, but they failed to take any action. Plaintiff claimed that but for defendants' in-

---

* At one point, plaintiff stated "I complained to the counselor, Mr. Ray Young [about Derrick]. * * * It wasn't actually a complaint, but, you know, it was talk." Tr. 111.

action, he would have never been injured on January 22nd. Liability was predicated solely upon the fact that plaintiff testified that various staff members were present during one or more of the threatening incidents he described above, so they should have taken steps to prevent an attack upon him by Derrick Greaves.

The Injury

Plaintiff was then taken to the St. Charles Hospital. From there, he was taken to the Elgin Hospital and then finally to the University of Illinois at Chicago Hospital. There, surgery was performed on his dislocated left hip. Afterwards he was sent back to the St. Charles Hospital. Plaintiff testified he was constantly in pain and had to remain in bed for the majority of the time he was in the hospital. (Tr. 97-104).

Relative to the injuries he sustained, his mother testified that ever since he injured his hip, he was not as active as he normally was, and that she paid $980 in medical bills. (Tr. 145, 162). Plaintiff also called as a medical expert Dr. Sean Hanlon. At the time, Dr. Hanlon was still doing his residency training in orthopedics at the University of Illinois at Chicago Hospital. Dr. Hanlon testified that he treated plaintiff for a left hip fracture. (Tr. 285-86).

The Trial

At the close of plaintiff's case in chief, the defendants moved for a directed verdict. The defendants argued that there was no evidence from which the jury could conclude that they had any knowledge of any alleged threats by Derrick Greaves, particularly since plaintiff admitted never telling any of the defendants of these prior incidents and never requesting protection from Derrick Greaves.

Therefore the defendants argued that they could not have been callously indifferent to plaintiff's need for protection because they had no knowledge of these or any prior alleged altercations with Derrick Greaves. (Tr. 66-71, Doc. 47). The District Court granted the motion as to defendant Barbara Fredrickson, but denied it as to the remaining defendants. (C48, Tr. 335-336). At the close of the trial, defendants renewed their motion for directed verdicts; however, the motions were denied. (Tr. 489). On appeal the plaintiff did not question the directed verdict in favor of Ms. Fredrickson.

On February 17, 1984, the jury returned a verdict in favor of the plaintiff and against each of the individual defendants. In each individual verdict form, it assessed compensatory damages of $40,000. (Docs. 57-61). On February 22, 1984, the defendants filed their post-trial motion requesting a judgment notwithstanding the verdict (JNOV), or in the alternative a new trial. (Doc. 64a).

Subsequently, on February 27, 1984, the defendants filed a motion to clarify the judgment. They maintained that the $40,000 in compensatory damages was the total award of plaintiff's injury verdict. (Doc. 64b). On March 12, 1984, the plaintiff filed his response to the above motions. On July 3, 1984, the District Court, in a Memorandum Opinion, granted a JNOV for defendant Barry Steele, denied it as to the remaining defendants, and also granted the defendants' motion to clarify the judgment and held that the defendants Brown, Cejka, Laurent and Van Joske were together liable to plaintiff for no more than $40,000. (Doc. 77).

On July 20, 1984, plaintiff filed his notice of appeal and the defendants filed their cross-appeal on August 1, 1984. (Docs. 79, 81). Thereafter, on August 24, 1984, plaintiff

filed in the Court of Appeals a "Motion for Extension of Time to File Plaintiff-Appellant's Brief and Appendix and to Supplement Record." In this motion, he sought to supplement the District Court record with two juror affidavits.

On August 28, 1984, that Court ordered: "Appellant shall file a separate motion to supplement the record indicating the nature of the affidavits and whether they comply with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 10." On September 28, 1984, plaintiff filed a "Motion to Supplement The Record For Appeal" in the Northern District of Illinois. The District Court denied this motion and explained that under Fed. R. App. P. 10, this motion should be brought before the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, because:

> Plaintiff never offered the affidavits for the district court's consideration. He neglected to add them in response to defendants' motion to clarify the verdict. Therefore, appending them to the record now adds nothing to the accuracy or completeness of the record. In support of his version of the jury verdict, plaintiff is trying to add new evidence that the district court never had the opportunity to review.

(Doc. 93).

On November 15, 1984, the plaintiff filed his motion to supplement the record on appeal with the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. This motion was taken with the case.

The Appeal

The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the jury verdict against defendants Laurent, Cejka, Brown, and Van Joske, because these defendants were present dur-

ing one or more of the threats described above, and because, * * *

> The plaintiff was apparently a credible witness, whose testimony if believed established that each of the defendants was an eyewitness on at least one occasion to an explicit threat made against Watts by Greaves. Moreover, the evidence taken in a light most favorable to plaintiff established that in evaluating the potential seriousness of that threat each defendant was armed with the knowledge that Greaves was physically much larger than Watts, and that the two lived in the same cottage. Various testimony supported the inference that gang activity permeated the Youth Center and that Greaves was a gang leader while Watts resisted joining any gang. The defendants were directly responsible for observing and supervising residents' behavior, and they were in almost daily contact with both Watts and Greaves. Under these circumstances we agree with the trial court that the evidence was sufficient to demonstrate that defendants Laurent, Cejka, Brown and Van Joske knew there was a strong likelihood of an assault, and therefore the court did not err in refusing to grant a judgment notwithstanding the verdict.

Slip Op. at 7-8, App. 7-8.

With respect to plaintiff's appeal from the JNOV granted to defendant Steele, the Seventh Circuit affirmed this result as well because Steele was not present during any of the above threats, nor was there any evidence that he had reason to know of Greaves' animosity towards plaintiff. As that court explained,

> Without such evidence, we cannot see what might have prompted Steele to inquire further into the situation. Surely Steele was not responsible for segregating every gang bully with a history of misbehavior from every smaller non-gang member resident. In short, the jury could not infer from this evi-

> dence that Steele had knowledge of the risk. Thus the court properly granted the judgment notwithstanding the verdict as to defendant Steele.

Slip Op. at 10, App. 10.

On October 10, 1985, the State defendants filed a petition for rehearing with a suggestion for rehearing *in banc*. In their petition for rehearing, the defendants argued that, as a matter of law, liability was improperly imposed under the Eighth Amendment because even assuming that defendants were aware of all of the incidents which plaintiff described, they were still not deliberately indifferent to his need for protection. This petition was denied on November 1, 1985.

REASONS FOR ALLOWING THE WRIT

THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION SANCTIONING THE IMPOSITION OF EIGHTH AMENDMENT LIABILITY IN THIS CASE OFFENDS TRADITIONAL PRINCIPLES OF FEDERALISM BY IMPINGING UPON THE WIDE-RANGING DEFERENCE WHICH IS TO BE ACCORDED TO STATE PRISON OFFICIALS BY THE FEDERAL COURTS AND IMPROPERLY AUTHORIZES EIGHTH AMENDMENT RECOVERIES FOR ISOLATED VIOLENT INCIDENTS OCCURRING IN STATE PRISONS.

Personal security, like medical care, is one of life's necessities to which inmates are entitled in "minimal civilized measure." *Rhodes v. Chapman*, 452 U.S. 337, 347 (1981). Accordingly, the Eighth Amendment protects all prison inmates from cruel and unusual punishment, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 102-03 (1967), including punishment inflicted in the form of attacks by fellow inmates, provid-

ing prisoners with a federally-protected right to be reasonably free from such attacks. *Miller v. Solem*, 728 F.2d 1020, 1024 (8th Cir.), *cert. den.*, 105 S. Ct. 145 (1984); *Branchcomb v. Brewer*, 669 F.2d 1297, 1298 (8th Cir. 1982); *Clark v. Taylor*, 710 F.2d 4, 9 (1st Cir. 1983); *Little v. Walker*, 552 F.2d 193 (7th Cir. 1977), *cert. den.*, 435 U.S. 932 (1978). Thus, prison officials have a duty to take steps to control violence and protect inmates from physical abuse by other inmates, *Ramos v. Lamm*, 639 F.2d 559, 572 (10th Cir. 1980), and they can be held liable both for their affirmative actions inflicting physical abuse on inmates, and for their "failure to act, when there is a duty to act, to prevent such [violence by other inmates]." *Clark v. Taylor, supra*, 710 F.2d at 9 (*citing Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 168, 187 (1961)).

However, in order to sustain Eighth Amendment liability for failure to adequately protect an individual inmate, that inmate must show

> . . . something more than mere inadvertence or negligence. He must show [that] the defendants were deliberately indifferent to his constitutional rights, either because they actually intended to deprive him of some right, or because they acted with reckless disregard of his right to be free from violent attacks by fellow inmates.

Branchcomb v. Brewer, supra, 669 F.2d at 1298.

The constitutional mandate against cruel and unusual punishment is "not a warranty of pleasant prison conditions." *Ruiz v. Estelle*, 679 F.2d 1115, 1145 (5th Cir.), *amended in part*, 688 F.2d 266 (5th Cir. 1982), *cert. den.*, 460 U.S. 1042 (1983). Prisons need not be country clubs, or even comfortable. *Rhodes v. Chapman*, 452 U.S. 337, 349 (1981). Furthermore, prison officials are not the insurers of the safety of their prisoners, *Jones v. United*

States, 534 F.2d 53, 54 (5th Cir.), *cert. den.*, 429 U.S. 978 (1976), so prisoners do not have the right to demand that state institutions be made so safe that they will be free from all assaults by other inmates.

In accordance with the foregoing principles, mere negligence or inadvertence is never sufficient to justify the imposition of liability under the Eighth Amendment. *Estate of Davis v. Johnson*, 745 F.2d 1066, 1070 (7th Cir. 1984); *Patzig v. O'Neal*, 577 F.2d 841, 847-48 (3d Cir. 1978). Rather, the plaintiff must show that prison officials have demonstrated deliberate indifference to his need for protection. *Little v. Walker*, 552 F.2d 193, 197 (7th Cir. 1977), *cert. den.*, 435 U.S. 932 (1978).

In order to find deliberate indifference when a prison official fails to protect a particular prisoner from the risk of an attack by a fellow inmate, there must be a "strong likelihood"—rather than a mere possibility—that violence will occur. *State Bank of St. Charles v. Camic*, 712 F.2d 1140, 1146 (7th Cir. 1983); *United States ex rel. Miller v. Twomey*, 479 F.2d 701 (7th Cir. 1973), *cert. den.*, 414 U.S. 1146 (1974). Thus, before liability will be imposed under the Eighth Amendment, plaintiff must establish that prison officials acted with reckless disregard of his right to be free from violent attacks by his fellow inmates. *Little v. Walker*, *supra*, 552 F.2d at 197-98.

Finally, even where such indifference has been shown, the plaintiff must still show a causal connection between a defendant's deliberate indifference and the injury for which compensation is sought. *Parratt v. Taylor*, 451 U.S. 527 (1981); *McKenna v. County of Nassau*, 538 F. Supp. 737 (E.D.N.Y.), *aff'd*, 714 F.2d 115 (2d Cir. 1982).

Imposition of liability under the Eighth Amendment in the instant case was clearly inappropriate under these

well-settled standards because plaintiff here did not show that defendants had been deliberately indifferent to his need for protection, nor did he establish a causal connection between the incident for which he recovered damages and the actions of the defendants (even assuming that those actions constituted deliberate indifference).

Prison officials cannot be expected to eliminate all violent behavior in the volatile atmosphere of a prison setting. As this Court has often acknowledged, a prison is

> a closely, tightly controlled environment peopled by those who have chosen to violate the criminal law and have been lawfully incarcerated for doing so. Some are first offenders, but many are recidivists who have repeatedly employed illegal and often very violent means to attain their ends. They may have little regard for the safety of others or their property or for the rules designed to provide an orderly and reasonably safe prison life.

Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 561-62 (1974). *See also Hudson v. Palmer*, ____ U.S. ____, 104 S. Ct. 3194, 3200 (1984). In such a volatile atmosphere, it must be presumed that disputes among the inmates occur constantly. Indeed, the undisputed evidence in this case was that the verbal disputes plaintiff testified about were commonplace occurrences at the St. Charles facility where he was confined. When such disputes occur between two prisoners, the prison officials must exercise their best judgment with respect to the question of whether future violence is likely to occur as a result of the disputes.

As this Court has also recognized, such exercises of judgment involve "purely subjective evaluations and . . . predictions of future behavior." *Hewitt v. Helms*, 459 U.S. 460, 472 (1983) (*citing Connecticut Bd. of Pardons v. Dumschat*, 452 U.S. 458, 464 (1981)). Under the decision of the

Seventh Circuit in the instant case, prison officials can be held liable for such an exercise in judgment whenever one prisoner is later injured by another prisoner with whom he had prior verbal disputes which were overheard by prison officials. In effect, this decision makes the State prison officials the insurers of all the prisoners in their care, a result which is patently improper, and which will unquestionably hamper prison officials in the future when they must consider the appropriate action to be taken under similar circumstances.

In *Fleishour v. United States*, 244 F. Supp. 762 (N.D. Ill. 1965), *aff'd*, 365 F.2d 126 (7th Cir.), *cert. den.*, 385 U.S. 987 (1966), Judge Will stressed that

> * * * all aspects of prison life which seek to encourage rehabilitation and responsible conduct by prisoners inevitably involve calculated risks. Most of those incarcerated have greater or lesser assaultive tendencies and the only certain way to insure against prison episodes is by complete isolation which is not only physically very difficult, if not impossible, but also least likely to induce positive attitudes in and the rehabilitation of persons so treated.
>
> Accordingly, it is, . . . standard practice in modern penal institutions to take calculated risks in various aspects of prison life, housing, work, recreation, religious worship and others, so that prisoners may learn to get along with other persons as part of the rehabilitation process. * * *

Id. at 767.

Rehabilitation and socialization are appropriate goals in any prison setting, particularly in a facility where juvenile offenders are housed, such as the one involved in the instant case. If prison officials are faced with the threat of large monetary judgments against them when they take no action to separate prisoners who have had several verbal

arguments which later might result in a fight, those officials will not be able to honestly exercise their best judgment to achieve rehabilitation goals. Rather, they will be forced to take as many preventative measures as are available (including segregation), to minimize the risk of such judgments. This is the unfortunate, but inevitable, result if the opinion of the Seventh Circuit in this case is not reversed. It is a result which impedes proper administration and maintenance by the states of their penal systems—an area historically within the domain and control of those sovereign entities. *See Procunier v. Martinez*, 416 U.S. 396, 404-05 (1974); *Battle v. Anderson*, 564 F.2d 388, 391-92 (10th Cir. 1977).

State officials should be free to exercise their best judgment with respect to the question of whether arguments over a card game or pool game, or comments such as "You're lucky you're a shorty and one day you're going to get yours" can be safely disregarded as typical "tough talk" between two prison inmates. Thus, intervention by the federal courts was inappropriate under the facts presented by this case, and the Seventh Circuit's opinion imposing Eighth Amendment liability on defendants here sanctions interference with the day-to-day operations of the State's prison system.

It is unfortunate that plaintiff in the instant case was injured, but he was subjected to no more risk that the calculated risk which is inherent in any prison setting, so he has not shown the requisite deliberate indifference justifying the imposition of Eighth Amendment liability. The decision of the Seventh Circuit in this case, while initially acknowledging the deliberate indifference standard, proceeds to affirm a judgment against the State defendants on facts which evidence no intentional or reckless conduct whatsoever on the defendants' part. Thus,

in essence this decision conflicts with decisions in other circuits where courts have refused to impose liability under such circumstances. *See*, e.g., *Jones v. Diamond*, 594 F.2d 997, 1016 (5th Cir. 1979); *Hite v. Leeke*, 564 F.2d 670 (4th Cir. 1977); *Hampton v. Holmesburg Prison Officials*, 546 F.2d 1077, 1081 (3d Cir. 1976); *O'Neal v. Evans*, 496 F. Supp. 867 (S.D. Ga. 1980). Other courts have refused to impose liability for an "isolated" attack by a fellow prisoner, even where the plaintiff has shown that prior threats were made by the inmate who attacked him, that the prisoner asked for protection, and that prison officials still failed to prevent the assault. *See Williams v. Field*, 416 F.2d 483, 484 (9th Cir. 1969); *Schall v. Rowe*, 460 F. Supp. 155, 157-58 (S.D. Ill. 1978); *Penn v. Oliver*, 351 F. Supp. 1292, 1294 (E.D. Va. 1972). The Seventh Circuit should likewise have refused to sanction the imposition of Eighth Amendment liability based upon the facts of the instant case, particularly where it was undisputed that plaintiff never asked for protection from Derrick Greaves.

Indeed, the decision of the Seventh Circuit in the instant case conflicts with its own later decision in *Duckworth v. Franzen*, Nos. 85-1010, 85-1053, 85-1084, 85-1095, Dec. 17, 1985, App. 45-63, where the Court reversed a jury award of $561,000 in damages against State officials and held that the defendants' motion for a JNOV on the Eighth Amendment claim was improperly denied. Slip Op. at 16, App. at 60. In *Duckworth* the Court emphasized, with respect to Eighth Amendment claims, that

> [i]f the word "punishment" in cases of prisoner mistreatment is to retain a link with normal usage, the infliction of suffering on prisoners can be found to violate the Eighth Amendment only if that infliction is either deliberate, or reckless in the criminal law sense. Gross negligence is not enough * * *

> * * * Punishment implies at a minimum actual knowledge of impending harm easily preventable, so that a conscious culpable refusal to prevent the harm can be inferred from the defendant's failure to prevent it. * * *

Slip Op. at 10, 11; App. at 54, 55.

Under the above definition, Eighth Amendment liability could not have been imposed in the instant case. Defendants had no "actual knowledge of impending harm" to the plaintiff here. Moreover, a serious question must be raised concerning the appropriate action which should have been taken in this case, and which should be taken by State prison officials in the future to prevent such incidents from occurring. While there was evidence in this case that Derrick was a "bully," and a gang member, there was no evidence that he physically attacked anyone prior to the incident involved in this case. Prison officials should not be required to segregate every aggressive prisoner who has several arguments with other prisoners to avoid liability under the Eighth Amendment. Indeed, this requirement would place an impossible burden on these officials in light of the numerous aggressive prisoners confined in the State system and the limited resources available to deal with these individuals.

Moreover, even assuming *arguendo* that plaintiff in this case had shown that defendants were guilty of deliberate indifference to his need for protection when they failed to take action to protect him from Derrick, he nevertheless failed to show any direct connection between the defendants' failure to respond to four earlier threatening incidents and his injury, an assault occurring without prior notice some three to four weeks after the earlier arguments. Defendants did not know (and had no reason to know) that Derrick would act against the plaintiff when

he did. Furthermore, the attack itself was without any prior warning. All of the students were running across the field and Derrick tackled plaintiff and fell on top of him. Derrick immediately jumped up and left, so there was nothing which could have been done at the time to prevent the injury to plaintiff. Thus, it is plain that the defendants' motion for a directed verdict or their motion for a judgment notwithstanding the verdict should have been granted in this case.

The Eighth Amendment does not justify the liability which was imposed here, even assuming that the defendants were aware of each of the prior threats as plaintiff testified to them. At best, plaintiff showed that those officials erroneously failed to perceive that those arguments would result in an attack some three to four weeks later, an error in judgment which should not be actionable under the Eighth Amendment.

In two recent decisions, *Daniels v. Williams*, ____ U.S. ____, 46 CCH Sup. Ct. Bull. 609 (1986); *Davidson v. Cannon*, ____ U.S. ____, 46 CCH Sup. Ct. Bull. 627 (1986), this Court addressed the question of whether prisoners could recover under the Fourteenth Amendment for a negligent act by prison officials and concluded that such recoveries were not authorized. In *Davidson*, as in the instant case, the plaintiff was suing to recover damages because prison officials failed to protect him from an attack by another inmate. Despite the fact that plaintiff had warned the officials of a threat by the other inmate two days before he was attacked, this Court found that the failure of the State officials to protect him from the other prisoner was not actionable under the Fourteenth Amendment:

> Respondents' lack of due care in this case led to serious injury, but that lack of care simply does not approach the sort of abusive government conduct that

> the Due Process Clause was designed to prevent * * * Far from abusing governmental power, or employing it as an instrument of oppression, respondent Cannon mistakenly believed that the situation was not particularly serious, and respondent James simply forgot about the note. The guarantee of due process has never been understood to mean that the State must guarantee due care on the part of its officials.

Id. at 632.

While it is true that *Davidson* did not involve an Eighth Amendment claim, the facts of that case are quite similar to those presented by the instant case. Both cases present the question of whether a prisoner should be permitted to recover damages for injuries he received as a result of being attacked by another inmate when prison officials failed to prevent the attack. Moreover, the facts in *Davidson* showed more culpability on defendants' part because of the warnings that an attack might take place and because of the proximity in time between the threat and the attack.

In contrast to the facts presented in *Davidson*, in the instant case neither plaintiff nor anyone else ever warned prison officials that plaintiff might be attacked by Derrick, nor was there ever any prior physical violence between Derrick and the plaintiff. The incident for which recovery was had in this case was an isolated violent incident which, according to plaintiff's own testimony, occurred three to four weeks subsequent to the threatening remarks presumably overheard by one of more of the defendants. Under these circumstances, the Seventh Circuit's conclusion that "reasonable people could have differed about whether each of the defendants had sufficient knowledge [of these threats] that a 'strong likelihood' of an attack existed," Slip Op. at 7, App. 7, was erroneous as a matter

of law because the defendants' conduct here did not evidence "deliberate indifference." A negligent failure to guard one prisoner to prevent an attack by another prisoner is not actionable under the Constitution. Thus, even if defendants overheard each of the threats as plaintiff described them, their failure to act to prevent the attack in this case cannot be said to have crossed over the "abundantly clear" distinction between negligence and intent. *Daniels v. Williams, supra,* at 616. Therefore, the Seventh Circuit's affirmance of Eighth Amendment liability in this case is inconsistent with the holding in *Davidson* that such a failure to guard does not state a constitutional violation and the Seventh Circuit's decision in this case must be reversed.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, petitioners respectfully pray that this Court grant their Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. Alternatively, petitioners pray that this Court either summarily reverse the decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals imposing Eighth Amendment liability on these defendants, or remand this case for recon-

sideration in light of your recent decisions in *Daniels* and *Davidson*.

Respectfully submitted,

NEIL F. HARTIGAN
Attorney General, State of Illinois

ROMA JONES STEWART
Solicitor General, State of Illinois

100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-3000

Attorneys for Petitioners

PATRICIA ROSEN *
Assistant Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-2570

* Counsel of Record

85-1299

No.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 28 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

JAMES LAURENT, Youth Supervisor II, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

JEFFREY WATTS,

Respondent.

APPENDIX TO THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

NEIL F. HARTIGAN
Attorney General, State of Illinois
ROMA JONES STEWART
Solicitor General, State of Illinois
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-3000
Attorneys for Petitioners

PATRICIA ROSEN *
Assistant Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-2570
* Counsel of Record

Printed by Authority of the State of Illinois (P.O. 33101—55—1-27-86)

INDEX TO APPENDIX

	PAGE
Opinion of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals .	1
Opinion of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division .	26
Opinion of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in *Duckworth v. Franzen*, Nos. 85-1010, 85-1053, 85-1084, 85-1095, Dec. 17, 1985	45
Order of the United States Court of Appeals Denying Rehearing	64

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1985

JAMES LAURENT, Youth Supervisor II, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

JEFFREY WATTS,

Respondent.

APPENDIX TO THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Nos. 84-2219 and 84-2290

JEFFREY WATTS,

Plaintiff-Appellant, Cross-Appellee,

v.

JAMES LAURENT, Youth Supervisor II., et al.,

Defendants-Appellees, Cross-Appellants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the
Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 C 4593—**Bernard M. Decker**, *Judge.*

ARGUED JUNE 4, 1985—DECIDED SEPTEMBER 18, 1985

Before CUDAHY and EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judges*, and SWYGERT, *Senior Circuit Judge.*

CUDAHY, *Circuit Judge.* Plaintiff, Jeffrey Watts, suffered a severe injury to his left leg and hip while he was an inmate at the Illinois Youth Center located in St. Charles, Illinois. He brought this suit, under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, against several state employees who worked at the Youth Center, alleging they violated his constitutional right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. After trial, a jury returned verdicts against five defendants, but the trial court granted one of the defendants, Barry Steele, judgment notwithstanding the verdict. The remaining defendants appeal the verdicts against them, and plaintiff appeals the court's decision in favor of defendant Steele. Plaintiff also attacks the trial court's decision to grant defendants' post-trial motion to clarify the amount of the judgment.

I.

The Youth Center at St. Charles is designated a medium/maximum security facility, and houses several hundred young criminal offenders. Plaintiff Jeffrey Watts arrived there on July 21, 1981, at which time he had just turned fifteen and weighed about 125 pounds. When residents arrive at the Youth Center, administrators assign them to a cottage according to their disposition and background. Watts was assigned to Pierce Cottage. Employees designated as "youth supervisors" oversee the residents. Four of the five defendants involved in this appeal[1]—Althea Brown, Geri Cejka, James Laurent and Steven VanJoske—were youth supervisors at the Center while Watts was there. Their duties included taking regular head counts, conducting residents to and from meals and classes, keeping daily records on each resident's behavior and administering discipline. The fifth defendant, Barry Steele, acted as a "team leader," and was also responsible for supervising the Teen Center, a recreational facility for the residents.

On January 22, 1982, the residents of Pierce Cottage met outside the cafeteria after lunch. Defendants Brown and VanJoske were taking a head count before leading the residents back to the cottage, when several residents began running over the field in the direction of Pierce. There was conflicting testimony about whether the students had been given permission to run. One of those running was plaintiff Watts; another was Derrick Greaves. The testimony was in conflict about what happened next. Watts testified he was running when he suddenly found himself on the ground with Greaves on top of him; he claimed Greaves had attacked him. Defen-

[1] Two additional defendants were dismissed from the action prior to trial and another defendant received a directed verdict in her favor at the close of plaintiff's case in chief. Plaintiff does not question these dismissals on appeal.

dants, on the other hand, argued that Watts had slipped on some ice. Watts suffered permanent damage to his hip joint, severely impairing his ability to walk and run.

Plaintiff's theory at trial was that Greaves had threatened Watts at least four times prior to the attack, and that defendants were aware of these threats but took no action to protect him. Greaves had arrived at the Youth Center on November 25, 1981, after being transferred from a minimum security prison at Valley View, Illinois because of his behavior there. During the relevant period, Greaves was about 5'7" tall and weighed approximately 155 pounds. Watts testified at trial that many of the inmates at the Youth Center were members of gangs, and that several gangs had attempted to recruit him although he never joined one. Other testimony indicated that Greaves considered himself the "chief" of one gang, the Black Gangster Disciples. Various evidence supported the inference that the threats and attack could have been gang-related, in that Watts' independence prior to the attack undermined Greaves' authority as a gang chief. Plaintiff's evidence indicated that each of the four defendants who were youth counselors overheard incidents in which Greaves threatened Watts. Although there was no direct evidence that defendant Steele ever overheard such a threat, Watts' theory at trial was that Steele became aware of the danger to Watts through his knowledge of Greaves' record, his opportunity to observe Greaves' behavior and his recognition that Watts was much smaller than Greaves and other residents. All of the defendants testified that they were not aware of any extraordinary animosity between Watts and Greaves. Additional facts are noted in the remainder of this opinion where pertinent.

II.

Defendants Laurent, Cejka, Brown and VanJoske each argue that the trial court erred in refusing to grant their motions for judgment notwithstanding the verdict,

because no reasonable jury could have found that they violated plaintiff's eighth amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. More particularly, these defendants deny that they had any knowledge of the danger plaintiff claims was posed by Derrick Greaves.

A motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict is properly denied where the evidence and all reasonable inferences, when viewed in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion, is such that reasonable people in a fair and impartial exercise of their judgment may reach different conclusions. *Estate of Davis v. Johnson*, 745 F.2d 1066, 1070 (7th Cir. 1984). This standard implies that a judgment notwithstanding the verdict should rarely be granted where the apparent correctness of the verdict turns on credibility determinations.

With these general principles in mind, we turn to the standards governing whether these defendants may be held liable for depriving plaintiff of rights secured under the eighth amendment. In *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), the Supreme Court held that deliberate indifference to prisoners' serious medical needs constitutes the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain that is the hallmark of cruel and unusual punishment. *Id.* at 104. Since that case, this court has repeatedly recognized that the failure of institutional personnel to protect a prisoner from the assaults of other prisoners can also rise to the level of an eighth amendment violation. *See e.g., Estate of Davis v. Johnson*, 745 F.2d at 1071; *Little v. Walker*, 552 F.2d 193, 197 (7th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied*, 435 U.S. 932 (1978). Nevertheless, conduct that simply amounts to "mere negligence or inadvertence" is insufficient to justify the imposition of liability. *Estate of Davis v. Johnson*, 745 F.2d 1066 at 1070. Rather, "[i]n order to infer callous indifference when an official fails to protect a prisoner from the risk of attack, there must be a 'strong likelihood' rather than a 'mere possibility' that violence will occur." *Id.* at 1071 (quoting *State Bank of St. Charles v. Camic*, 712 F.2d 1140, 1146 (7th Cir. 1983)), *cert. denied*, 104 S. Ct. 491 (1984). "[A] guard does not have to believe to a moral

certainty that one inmate intends to attack another at a given place at a time certain before that officer is obligated to take steps to prevent such an assault." *State Bank of St. Charles v. Camic*, 712 F.2d at 1146 (quoting *VanCannon v. Breed*, 391 F. Supp. 1371 (N.D. Cal. 1975)). The failure to protect a prisoner on even a single occasion can give rise to liability where it can be inferred that an institutional employee should have realized that there was a "strong likelihood" of an attack.[2] *See Redmond v. Baxley*, 475 F. Supp. 1111, 1117 (E.D. Mich. 1979).

Each of the defendants argues that the evidence was insufficient to demonstrate that he or she was aware of a "strong likelihood" that Greaves would attack Watts; indeed, each claimed at trial to have no knowledge of any particular friction between the two boys, much less of the specific threats testified to by Watts. These defendants also stress, as they did before the trial court, the uncontested fact that Watts never told any of the defendants he was afraid of Greaves as a result of the threats, and argue that defendants therefore had no opportunity to take steps to protect him. Because the trial court reviewed the evidence relevant to these claims in some detail, we quote from its conclusions with respect to each defendant:

> *Althea Brown:* Watts testified that Brown was on duty one morning when the residents of Pierce Cottage lined up for breakfast. Watts ended up first in line. Greaves told Watts that Greaves went first because Greaves was in charge of the cottage. Greaves allegedly said, "'You're lucky [you're] a

[2] The defendants in this case do not challenge any of the instructions given at trial. They did not ask for an instruction requiring the victim to show that the defendants knew that the victim was at greater or more clearly defined risk than others in the institution, given the usual level of violence among inmates. They also did not ask for an instruction that would have made liability depend on some sort of notice or indication from the victim that there had been threats. We, of course, need not decide whether such instructions would have been appropriate and do not make any suggestions with regard to them.

shorty and one day you're going to get yours.'" Tr. (February 13, 1984) at 14-15.

Brown asserts that she never overheard this threat, in part because she was supervising twenty-eight residents. Nevertheless, the jury could have disregarded her testimony and inferred from Watts' testimony that she overheard the threat. Coupled with knowledge that gang loyalties led to violence in the facility, Brown could have known enough to show the necessary deliberate indifference. At trial, she testified that she was aware of no gang activity that went unpunished at St. Charles. She appeared knowledgeable in general, however, about gangs and their activities. Given the other reasonable testimony evidencing extensive gang activity at St. Charles and Brown's knowledge of gang behavior, her denials of gang activity may have rung hollow and undermined her credibility.

Geri Cejka: Watts testified that Cejka witnessed a fight between Watts and Greaves over a card game. Although Watts was hesitant and uncertain on cross-examination, he stuck to his story that Cejka was on duty and in the same room as Watts and Greaves during the argument. Cejka herself agreed that she disciplined both boys on another occasion for a similar argument.

When Cejka testified, Watts' counsel impeached her by reading from a letter in which she referred to Greaves as a "heavy." She wrote the letter shortly after the January 22nd incident, but the jury could have inferred that she based her opinion in the letter on activity that took place before the incident. Tr. (February 14, 1984) at 50. She explained that, by "heavy," she meant that Greaves was "bossy" and "wanted his way all the time." *Id.* at 49-51, 59-60. This statement by itself indicated that she considered Greaves to be overly aggressive. The jury could also have decided that "heavy" implied that Greaves was dangerous and that Cejka's belittling of this comment

hurt her credibility. If the jury believed Watts' story about Cejka's involvement, she clearly had enough knowledge to conclude that Greaves would give the "shorty" Watts "his."

James Laurent: Watts testified that Laurent was present for a threat that took place on the grass outside the cafeteria. Laurent argued that he was talking to students some distance away. In addition, Watts testified that he never told Laurent about the threat or about his fear of Greaves. Again, the jury could have reasonably concluded that, even though talking to other students, Laurent overheard the threat. Since Greaves was much larger than Watts, witnessing such a threat could have alerted Laurent to the danger Greaves posed to Watts.

Steven VanJoske: Plaintiff's testimony was that VanJoske was on duty during two of the alleged threats. For one of the threats, he was at the hospital with another resident. The jury could not conclude that he overheard this threat. During the second threat, he was present taking a head count of the Pierce Cottage residents. Although he claims he never overheard the threat, the jury could have inferred from Watts' testimony that VanJoske heard it.

Watts v. Peters, No. 82 C 4593 (N.D. Ill. July 2, 1984) (Mem. Opinion at 11-14).

It is clear from the summary of the evidence quoted above that reasonable people could have differed about whether each of the defendants had sufficient knowledge to realize that a "strong likelihood" of an attack existed. The plaintiff was apparently a credible witness, whose testimony if believed established that each of the defendants was an eyewitness on at least one occasion to an explicit threat made against Watts by Greaves. Moreover, the evidence taken in a light most favorable to plaintiff established that in evaluating the potential seriousness of that threat each defendant was armed with the knowledge that Greaves was physically much larger than Watts,

and that the two lived in the same cottage. Various testimony supported the inference that gang activity permeated the Youth Center and that Greaves was a gang leader while Watts resisted joining any gang. The defendants were directly responsible for observing and supervising residents' behavior, and they were in almost daily contact with both Watts and Greaves. Under these circumstances we agree with the trial court that the evidence was sufficient to demonstrate that defendants Laurent, Cejka, Brown and VanJoske knew there was a strong likelihood of an assault, and therefore the court did not err in refusing to grant a judgment notwithstanding the verdict.

The remaining defendant, Barry Steele, also was found liable by the jury, but this result was reversed by a judgment notwithstanding the verdict. Plaintiff contends that the trial court erred in setting aside the verdict because there was substantial evidence establishing that Steele had knowledge of the risk of harm to Watts posed by Derrick Greaves. Defendant Steele was a "Team Leader" at the Youth Center and was also in charge of supervising the Teen Center, a recreation area. As Team Leader, Steele was responsible for receiving disciplinary reports on residents. He presided over disciplinary hearings and decided whether a resident should be moved because of disciplinary infractions or for the resident's own protection. Steele had reviewed the master file on Derrick Greaves, and so knew that he had been transferred to the Youth Center because of behavior problems. Steele also knew Jeffrey Watts quite well, and, in fact, undisputed evidence indicates that Steele made a special effort to develop a relationship with Watts and to make sure Watts was getting along satisfactorily. Plaintiff argues that the court incorrectly reweighed the credibility of the witnesses in rejecting this testimony.

Even if all this evidence is accepted as fact, however, we agree with the district court that a jury could not reasonably conclude that Steele was aware of the risk to Watts but was deliberately indifferent to it. Steele's

responsibility for presiding over disciplinary hearings and for making disciplinary or protective segregation decisions establishes only that Steele probably had the power to protect Watts if he thought it necessary to do so. The essential question, however, is whether Steele had any reason to believe such steps were necessary. Plaintiff suggests that Steele could have gained knowledge about the risk to Watts from any one of several sources. In particular, "[t]he jury could have reasonably concluded that since Jeffrey [Watts] spoke with Barry Steele almost on a daily basis, the threats of harm were communicated [or that] since Barry Steele attended staffing meetings he received reports from each defendant concerning Greaves' behavior." Plaintiff's Br. at 34. Moreover, plaintiff contends Steele could have learned of the risk either from Derrick Greaves directly or from Greaves' master file.

While these possibilities are all quite adequate as hypotheses, however, they are insufficient as a basis for liability. Plaintiff presented absolutely no evidence that in any of their daily contacts he ever told Steele about the threats. Nor was there any testimony about what might have been communicated to Steele during staff meetings. The suggestion that Greaves might have announced to Steele his intention to attack Watts rather defies common sense, but, more important, there is no evidence to support it. Finally, there is no evidence that anything in Greaves' master file related to Greaves' hostility towards or altercations with Watts. In short, contrary to plaintiff's assertions, the problem is not that Steele denied knowledge of the risk; it is that Watts never presented evidence that Steele had such knowledge. The most that could be drawn from the plaintiff's evidence, viewing it in the light most favorable to him, is that Steele knew that Greaves had a history of behavior problems, that he was a gang chief, that he was a bully and had some disciplinary problems at the Youth Center. Steele presumably also knew that Watts was smaller than Greaves, was not a gang member and lived in the same cottage. Noticeably lacking, however, is any indication, as there was with the other defendants, that Steele knew of Greaves' particular ani-

mosity toward Watts or of the specific threats. Without such evidence we cannot see what might have prompted Steele to inquire further into the situation. Surely Steele was not responsible for segregating every gang bully with a history of misbehavior from every smaller non-gang member resident. In short, the jury could not infer from this evidence that Steele had knowledge of the risk. Thus the court properly granted the judgment notwithstanding the verdict as to defendant Steele.

III.

Surprisingly, the most difficult issue in this case relates not to liability but to damages: the parties sharply dispute what amount of damages the jury actually awarded to plaintiff. Throughout the trial, defendants were concerned that the jury might improperly find a defendant liable simply because he or she was joined with another defendant against whom the evidence was stronger. To counter this problem, the court stressed to the jury in its instructions that it should consider the case against each defendant separately. In particular, the court instructed the jury that:

> [A]lthough there is more than one defendant in this action, it does not follow from that fact that if one is liable that they are all liable. Each one is entitled to a fair consideration of his own defense and is not to be prejudiced by the fact . . . that you may find against one or more of the others. The instructions govern the case as to each defendant insofar as they're applicable to him or to her, to the same effect as if he or she were the only defendant in the case and . . . *you will decide each defendant's case separately as if it were a separate lawsuit.*

Defendant's Instruction No. 6, Tr., Vol. IV at 549-50 (emphasis added).

In addition to offering this instruction, defendants' counsel suggested that the court use separate verdict

forms for each defendant. The verdict form tendered by defendants contains a statement that "We, the jury, find for the plaintiff, Jeffrey Watts and against the defendant, [name of one defendant], and assess compensatory damages in the amount of $_____." The court agreed to use these forms over the objection of plaintiff, who stated that a general verdict form would be simpler. After trial, the jury returned verdicts in favor of plaintiff and against each of the individual defendants. On each individual verdict form, the jury filled in the amount "$40,000" in the blank left for compensatory damages. After the verdicts were rendered, a district judge (who was not the judge who had conducted the trial) entered judgment "for the plaintiff and against each of the defendants Althea Brown, Barry Steele, James Laurent, Geri Cejka, Steven VanJoske for compensatory damages in the sum of $40,000 as to each defendant individually." *Watts v. Peters*, No. 82 CR 4593 (N.D. Ill. February 17, 1984).

Ten days later, the defendants filed a joint motion to "clarify the judgment." They maintained that, although (under their interpretation) the district court had entered a judgment for the plaintiff in the total amount of $200,000, the jury had actually intended to award a total of $40,000 in damages against all of the defendants together. Plaintiff argued in response that the jury intended to award the plaintiff a total of $200,000 in damages, $40,000 assessed against each defendant separately. The district court judge who had heard the case decided in favor of defendants on this issue. Stressing that he had instructed the jury to consider each claim as if it were a separate lawsuit, the judge said he could

> read the verdicts in only one way .... As the jury considered each defendant, it concluded that a $40,000 award compensated Watts for his damage. For each verdict, the jury disregarded the other four defendants and decided what amount of money compensated Watts for his loss. In each case, the jury settled on a $40,000 award. The court will vacate its earlier order and enter a judgment against the defendants holding

> them jointly and severally liable for $40,000. Once Watts receives $40,000, the judgment will compensate him for his loss.

Watts v. Peters, No. 82 C 4593 (N.D. Ill. July 2, 1984) (Mem. Opinion at 6-7). The court thus vacated the earlier judgment and held that the defendants Brown, Cejka, Laurent and VanJoske "are together liable to Watts for no more than a total of $40,000. Each one, however, is liable to Watts for up to $40,000 until the judgment is satisfied." *Id.* at 26.

After plaintiff filed his notice of appeal, and the defendants filed their cross-appeal, plaintiff filed a "motion to supplement the record for appeal" in the district court. Watts wanted to supplement the record with the affidavits of two jurors who sat on the case; both stated that the jury determined that plaintiff was entitled to $200,000, $40,000 from each of the five defendants. The court denied the motion, explaining that under FED. R. APP. P. 10, the motion should be brought before this court. The court stated that since plaintiff neglected to offer the affidavits for the district court's consideration in response to defendants' motion to clarify the verdict, adding them to the record "adds nothing to the accuracy or completeness of the record." *Watts v. Peters*, No. 82 C 4593 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 8, 1984). Thereafter, plaintiff filed in this court a "Motion to Supplement Record on Appeal and for Relief under Circuit Rule 35(c)," which we must consider in the course of this opinion.

Plaintiff argues that it is plain from the face of the verdict forms that the jury intended to award plaintiff $40,000 from each defendant individually; and that this conclusion is made crystal clear by the instructions to the jury that it should consider the case against each defendant as if it were a separate lawsuit. Since, if each defendant had been tried separately, each would have been found individually liable for $40,000, plaintiff asserts, the jury merely followed its instructions and accomplished the same result as would have been accomplished after five

separate trials (total damages of $200,000) through the use of the separate forms. Defendants, on the other hand, contend that the forms indisputably show that the jury thought $40,000 was fair compensation for the plaintiff and awarded only this amount; since a single lawsuit against a single defendant would have yielded a $40,000 judgment as fair compensation, the fact that five defendants went to trial together should not mean the compensatory award should be increased fivefold. As noted, the trial court agreed with defendants, stating the verdicts could be read in "only one way." We feel compelled to comment that the only thing that seems "clear" about the jury verdicts is that they are ambiguous. Quite obviously, they can be interpreted in at least two ways, and the parties' simplistic assertions to the contrary are not helpful to this court.

There seems to have been some inadequacy in the theoretical development in this case. The trial court decided that the defendants were "jointly and severally liable" for the damages. Yet it permitted verdict forms to go to the jury that at least potentially allowed the jury to apportion damages among the various defendants. It appears to us that defendants' separate jury verdict forms were inherently ambiguous, and that the verdicts would have been open to question in any circumstance where the jury found more than one defendant liable. Thus, particularly in light of the outcome, we believe that the trial court erred in allowing those forms to be used.

Of course, the most obvious solution to our dilemma would be to remand the case for a new trial, at least on damages, using unambiguous verdict forms. Plaintiff has not requested this form of relief, however, and at oral argument repeatedly declined an opportunity to seek it (although he may not have clearly rejected it).[3] In any event, the whole colloquy with counsel quoted in the margin does not address specifically a new trial *limited to damages*. We have reserved until the end of this opinion

---

[3] [Court]: I assume under any circumstances here you would not want a new trial?

(Footnote continued on following page)

consideration of the possibility of a new trial on damages as a possible remedy for a situation brought about in the first instance by defendants' request for ambiguous jury forms. Initially, however, we shall address the decision

---

[3] *continued*

[Counsel]: Judge, I think the issues have been [indecipherable word] test by the jury. I think that . . . I think, uh, that the verdict is clear.

[Court]: I guess that I'm going back to the size of the verdict trial, you'd take the $40,000 rather than have a new trial?

[Counsel]: Judge, we were offered that option. We chose to appeal. If the . . . The court, quote, clarified the verdict from $200,000 to $40,000.

[Court]: Wouldn't another alternative be to remand this and have the jury . . . have a hearing, calling in the jury and ask . . .?

[Counsel]: Is there an option at this point? Uh, I don't know the necessity of it, judge, uh, because of the fact that—

[Court]: All right, [unintelligible].

[Counsel]: I assume that might be a possibility.

[Court]: If the only possibility were to retry the case, I take it you would not want that as a remedy?

[Counsel]: Well, I think that it would be a waste of judicial time, but I think . . . if, uh . . . .

[Court]: Well, I'm just asking whether you'd just take the $40,000 rather than a new trial?

[Counsel]: We choose not to, your Honor. We think that it is totally unjustified by the evidence.

[Court]: What's unjustified? You choose not to do what?

[Counsel]: We choose not to . . . we appealed immediately when the judge . . . Judge Decker entered his order, quote, clarifying the verdict from $200,000 to $40,000, we brought this appeal.

[Court]: Yes, I know you did. What I'm trying to figure out what is a proper remedy.

[Counsel]: What a proper remedy is . . . .

(Footnote continued on following page)

immediately put to us to choose between the parties' conflicting interpretations of the verdict forms used in the present trial.

---

[3] *continued*

[Court]: One possibility is to retry the case.

[Counsel]: Well, uh.

[Court]: I'm not sure you want us to do that?

[Counsel]: There could be an evidentiary hearing as far as the jurors . . . that, uh, could be brought in as to their verdict? I'm sure that's a possibility.

[Court]: You already have people who said that they awarded $200,000.

[Counsel]: Pardon me?

[Court]: Jurors filed affidavits that they were awarding $200,000.

[Counsel]: Absolutely, and those are attached to the briefs.

[Court]: Why didn't you ask for clarification?

[Counsel]: There was no necessity, the verdict was clear. The remedy would have been under *Herrera v. Valentine.*

* * *

[Court]: You don't want a new trial, then?

[Counsel]: Your Honor, I don't think it's a necessity, judge. I think . . . I think the jury has spoken in this case.

Rebuttal: A new attorney speaking on plaintiff's behalf:

[Counsel]: The jury found the $200,000 in damages. Based on those verdict forms and based on their affidavits, we submit them. You have taken the Motion to Supplement the Record under advisement. If you don't consider them, uh, the only remedy is a new trial which would be no remedy at all.

[Court]: You don't want that as a remedy?

[Counsel]: No, your Honor.

[Court]: You don't want it. All right.

Plaintiff argues that since defendants created the problem by using the separate verdict forms over plaintiff's objection, any ambiguity should be construed against defendants. *See, e.g., Drollinger v. Merrell*, 57 Ill. App. 3d 792, 798, 373 N.E.2d 407, 412 (1978) ("While we realize that it is the function of the court to furnish the jury proper forms of verdict, parties cannot invite error by their conduct or inaction and later assign as error that which is so invited in the event the verdict of the jury is not to their liking.") At the very least, Watts insists, the defendants' failure to ask the court to order the jury to clarify its intention when the verdicts were rendered should be construed as a waiver of the argument that the jury meant to award only $40,000 total damages. There is some authority for this reasoning. For example, in *Herrera v. Valentine*, 653 F.2d 1220 (8th Cir. 1981), the jury rendered a verdict for the plaintiff in the amount of $300,000. The jury was polled as to its verdict and then discharged. The defendants then sought to impeach the jury's verdict with the affidavits of two of the jurors, arguing that the verdict was irreconcilably inconsistent. The inconsistency apparently arose because the jury foreperson stated in response to a question by the trial court that the jury had only found violations of state law, while the verdict form itself indicated that only federal law violations had been found. The court said:

> The clerk read the verdict and the jurors were polled. There is nothing in the record to show that the appellants moved the court back into deliberations to cure any alleged defect in the verdict. After judgment had been entered, the appellants filed their motions for judgment notwithstanding the verdict and for a new trial. Included in these motions were *ex parte* affidavits of two jurors, the clear import of which was to impeach the jury's verdict . . . .
>
> If the appellants believed that the jury's verdict was unclear when rendered, the burden rested upon them to move the court, to order the jury back into

> deliberation. In our view, it is bad practice to wait until after the verdict is rendered and judgment is entered to reappear in court and attempt to impeach a verdict with affidavits that contradict their written verdict. *Cf. University Computing Co. v. Lykes-Youngstown Corp.*, 504 F.2d 518, 547 & nn.42-43 (5th Cir. 1974).

Herrera v. Valentine, 653 F.2d at 1226-27 n.5.

Plaintiff argues that defendants' motion to clarify the verdict was the equivalent of the defendants' attempt to impeach the verdict in *Herrera*, and that the reasoning in that case should be applied here to prevent the defendants from disputing the plaintiff's conception of the jury's verdict. This approach is tempting, especially since here, unlike *Herrera*, the difficulty in the verdict arose not from a juror's spontaneous remark but from the defendants' drafting of the verdict form. However, in this case there is nowhere a simple determination of the total damages which we can uphold against impeachment. True, the fact that no explicit total appears is due to defendants' submission of forms that have no place for such a total. However, plaintiff compounded the error by failing to point out to the district court what problems might arise from defendants' proposed verdict forms. Plaintiff never objected on the basis that the separate forms would prevent the jury from explicitly assigning a total value to plaintiff's injury, or would create any ambiguity about damages. Rather, he merely stated that a general verdict

---

[4] The following colloquy occurred during the jury instruction conference regarding the use of the separate forms proposed by defendants:

> THE COURT: And there are a lot of separate verdicts here, verdict forms .... I'm not sure I'm going to give—is there a Not Guilty as to each one too?
>
> [DEFENDANTS' ATTORNEY]: That is correct.

(Footnote continued on following page)

reluctant to simply select the plaintiff's interpretation on the basis of waiver where the ambiguity may well not have been apparent to the defendants (or for that matter to plaintiff) until after a trial judge construed the verdicts as separate rather than joint and several.

---

[6] *continued*

THE COURT: So it's one Guilty and one Not Guilty?

[DEFENDANTS' ATTORNEY]: Right.

* * *

[PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY]: I have a general verdict form for Guilty and Not Guilty.

THE COURT: You mean for all of them?

[PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY]: Yes.

THE COURT: I guess that's all right.

[DEFENDANTS' ATTORNEY]: Your Honor, we would prefer to have separate verdict forms for each party because I think there will be less confusion, and if the jury decides to find—

THE COURT: Tell me what the difficulty with a general one is if it applies across the board. If it's against—well, I think because of the damages involved and the separate people involved, I can't see any problem with this except the time in signing them.

[PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY]: If [defendants' attorney] is talking about simplification, the easy way is to make two verdict forms, two general ones.

THE COURT: I have done that and then the jury can be asked to insert the names and so forth and so on. I found out in a recent case there may be some confusion. I don't have any problem with this. Then each one will get some separate attention, which I guess they're each entitled to.

[DEFENDANTS' ATTORNEY]: That is what we would prefer.

Tr., Vol. III at 439-440.

Thus, our task remains to determine what the jury decided, based on its instructions and based on what the plaintiff conceives the task before the jury to have been. In making this determination we are guided by the parties' essential agreement that we should treat this case as if it consisted of five separate lawsuits, and by the legal principles that would govern recovery of damages in such a circumstance.

The linchpin of plaintiff's argument is his assertion that, had he brought five separate suits against the five individual defendants, each resulting in a $40,000 judgment, he would have been entitled to collect $40,000 from each of them for a total of $200,000. If this premise is correct, then we agree there is no reason plaintiff should be penalized for having joined all defendants in a single action (although of course the question whether the jury actually intended to award $200,000 here is a separate issue). If, on the other hand, five separate suits resulting in five $40,000 judgments would have yielded plaintiff only the right to collect a single $40,000 award, then the same logic dictates that plaintiff should not receive a windfall simply because all the defendants were present in a single trial.

This question in turn depends on whether or not these defendants were jointly and severally liable. Federal common law principles of tort and damages govern recovery under section 1983. *See Carey v. Piphus*, 435 U.S. 247 (1978); *Busche v. Burkee*, 649 F.2d 509, 518 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 454 U.S. 897 (1981); *Keyes v. Lauga*, 635 F.2d 330, 336 (5th Cir. 1981). It is axiomatic that where several independent actors concurrently or consecutively produce a single, indivisible injury, each actor will be held jointly and severally liable for the entire injury. RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS, §§ 875, 879; *Edmonds v. Compagnie Generale Transatlantique*, 443 U.S. 256, 260 & n.8 (1979). In such a case the injured party may proceed to judgment against any or all of the responsible actors in a single or in several different actions. *See* RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS, § 882. However, the very nature of damages as

compensation for injury suffered requires that once the plaintiff has been fully compensated for his injuries by one or more of the tortfeasors, he may not thereafter recover any additional compensation from any of the remaining tortfeasors. *See* RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS, § 885(3) and comment e, § 886 and comment a. *See also Dundee Cement Co. v. Howard Pipe and Concrete Products, Inc.*, 722 F.2d 1319, 1324 (7th Cir. 1983); *Whitehurst v. Charles Town Hospital*, 626 F.2d 357 (4th Cir. 1980).

Thus, if in this case each defendant's independent actions (or failure to take action) produced a single, indivisible injury, and if a lawsuit against any one defendant would have produced a compensatory judgment of $40,000, then the fact that plaintiff might have obtained five such judgments would mean only that those five defendants would be jointly and severally liable for $40,000, *not* that plaintiff could obtain satisfaction with respect to all the judgments for a total award of $200,000. Unfortunately, plaintiff has failed to make his position on this point clear to the court. His briefs refer in passing to the fact that the verdict forms do not mention joint and several liability, but this circumstance does not seem to meet the central issue of what theory plaintiff relied on. At oral argument, plaintiff's attorney was asked how the verdict would be affected if this court were to affirm the grant of judgment notwithstanding the verdict in favor of defendant Steele. He responded that the $200,000 verdict should be reapportioned among the remaining four defendants, a proposition that is more consistent with a theory of joint and several liability than with a theory that the $40,000 judgments corresponded to separate, divisible injuries.

Our search of the record discloses little in the plaintiff's evidence, argument or proposed jury instructions to indicate that he ever took the position that his injury was in any way divisible, such that the jury could have apportioned damages according to the degree or type of injury each defendant caused. In reviewing the instructions for the jury during closing argument, plaintiff's attorney told

the jury that it would be given verdict forms on which it would identify "an amount of damages" and that it would be up to the jury "to decide on those forms how to apportion the damages among the various defendants." Assuming this reference to apportionment was more than inadvertent, we are at a loss to see on what theory or evidentiary basis the jury was to have made such a determination. Plaintiff never argued that any defendant was more or less culpable (or that they were all equally culpable) for his injuries. Plaintiff never proposed separate damage figures for each defendant, but merely suggested that $150,000 might be appropriate compensation for plaintiff's injuries. In response to the court's questions at oral argument, plaintiff's attorney was unable to offer any justification for segregating damages to correspond to harm that each defendant caused. He merely stated that the jury must have found each defendant equally culpable.

In the absence of any suggestion to the contrary, we must conclude that plaintiff suffered a single, indivisible injury. The nature of the case appears to be such that each defendant's failure to protect plaintiff would have caused plaintiff's injury independently of the other defendants' failure to act, but the injury itself—the attack by Greaves—cannot be apportioned in any sensible way among the several defendants. Thus, this seems to be a classic case for imposing joint and several liability.

If this is correct, then it would make no difference whether plaintiff obtained a separate judgment against each defendant in five separate suits, or obtained five "separate" judgments against the defendant in a single suit. In either event, plaintiff is only entitled to receive from the five defendants jointly the same amount that he could receive from any single defendant individually. Thus, since plaintiff concedes (indeed insists) that a single suit against any individual defendant would have produced a judgment in the amount of $40,000 as fair compensation for his injuries, he is only entitled to receive $40,000 from all of the defendants, jointly and severally.

In short, the amount of damages necessary to compensate plaintiff for his injury is the essential first step determination; in this sort of case additional judgments against additional defendants merely provide additional sources of collection, not an enhanced standard of compensation.

Applying these principles to the question of what decision the jury reached, plaintiff could argue (although he has not) that the verdict is properly construed as joint and several, but it is in the amount of $200,000. There are several problems with this approach. First, it is inherently inconsistent with plaintiff's argument that a suit against a single defendant would have yielded a $40,000 judgment. As previously stated, if $40,000 was sufficient compensation for plaintiff's injuries, there is no basis consistent with joint and several liability for allowing a $200,000 judgment merely because additional defendants were joined. For the same reason, if the jury in fact first decided that $200,000 was appropriate compensation, but then apportioned that amount among the several defendants, such apportionment would violate the premise of joint and several liability for a single indivisible injury.

Most important, we would have to assume the jury disregarded its instructions. The jury was not instructed to reach a damage figure and then divide it up among the defendants it had found liable. Rather, it was instructed to consider each defendant's case as if it were a separate lawsuit, disregarding the others. If it followed these instructions, we would expect the result that occurred: the amount necessary to compensate the plaintiff was determined to be the same for each defendant. Under this analysis, what the jury might have believed after it reached its separate verdicts about whether or not the judgments would be aggregated is largely irrelevant, just as it would be in a lawsuit against a single defendant where the jury might be aware that other defendants had been or could be sued in separate actions.[5]

---

[5] Plaintiff asks us to consider the affidavits of two jurors which indicate the view that the jury intended to award $200,000.

(Footnote continued on following page)

This is a difficult and unusual case, and its proper resolution is by no means "clear." Nevertheless, because we cannot accept plaintiff's argument without assuming that the jury disregarded its instructions, and without doing violence to accepted principles of joint and several liability, we decline to do so. Nonetheless, we are aware that it was the defendants' initiative which led to the confusion, the effects of which cannot be entirely dispelled no matter how rigorous the after the fact analysis. We can never know with certainty as a matter of fact what was the intention of the original jury and the ultimate responsibility for this must be laid at defendants' feet.

We are, therefore, in the interests of justice prepared to offer the plaintiff a new trial on damages, which he may accept or reject at a time and in a manner to be specified

---

[5] *continued*

Defendants insist that we should not consider the affidavits on appeal since they were not offered for the district court's consideration prior to the ruling on the defendants' motion for clarification, but only in a motion to supplement the record. *See United States v. Gray*, 611 F.2d 194 (7th Cir. 1979), *cert. denied*, 446 U.S. 911 (1980). This case may be somewhat different, however, since plaintiff arguably seeks to use the affidavits in a defensive rather than offensive way. Regardless of the propriety of adding the affidavits to the record on appeal, there is a more fundamental problem which persuades us not to consider them. At best, the affidavits inform us about the perceptions of two out of six jurors; we have no way of knowing whether these are representative of the other jurors' views about the meaning of the verdict. We think if affidavits (or live testimony) were to be used as a method for resolving the ambiguous verdicts, all (or substantially all) of the jurors would have to be heard from in order for this effort to be probative. And, the jury's expectation, if it existed, that plaintiff was entitled to $200,000 because it had established the liability of five defendants does not justify an award in that amount where the jury had apparently determined that $40,000 was the amount sufficient to compensate the plaintiff in separate suits against the individual defendants.

by the district court on remand. We are not unaware of the possibilities for injustice inherent in new trials devoted only to damages. *See Gasoline Products Co. v. Champlin Refining Co.*, 238 U.S. 494, 499-500 (1931); *MCI Communications Corp. v. A.T.&T. Co.*, 708 F.2d 1081, 1166-68 (7th Cir. 1983). We therefore specify conditions which we believe will avoid, or at least minimize, the problems inherent in a procedure whereby a new jury addresses damage questions without knowledge of the evidence introduced in the liability phase of the trial. We therefore require that the parties shall have an opportunity to present to the second jury whatever evidence (through testimony, in summary form or as the district court shall permit) from the liability phase of the trial may be regarded as relevant in any way to the question of damages. To the extent that the parties may be able to stipulate to evidence or summaries of evidence from the liability phase, the proceeding will, of course, be expedited. The trial judge shall apply a broad standard with respect to the relevance of this sort of evidence and there shall be a strong presumption that evidence from the liability phase may be relevant in some way to damages.

The new jury shall be instructed that the relevant issues of liability have been previously decided and shall be instructed as to the legal basis of defendants' liability. These instructions shall not, however, preclude the free presentation of evidence and information from the liability phase to the extent such evidence is relevant, as indicated above, in any way to damages. Should the plaintiff elect to pursue a new trial on damages, he of course agrees to relinquish any claim to the $40,000 awarded by the first jury.[6]

The judgments against defendants Laurent, Cejka, Brown and VanJoske are therefore AFFIRMED as to liabil-

---

[6] Both parties and their counsel should be aware of the possible questions involving attorneys' fees in the event of a new trial on damages. *See Marek v. Chesny*, 105 S.Ct. 3011 (1985); *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424 (1983).

ity and, unless the plaintiff shall elect to proceed to a new trial on damages as provided in the opinion, these defendants shall be jointly and severally liable for $40,000. The judgment notwithstanding the verdict for defendant Steele is AFFIRMED. The plaintiff's motion to enlarge the record on appeal is denied. The question of damages is remanded to the district court. If the plaintiff shall elect to undertake a new trial on damages, that proceeding shall be conducted in accordance with this opinion, and the present conditional award of $40,000 shall be vacated. If the plaintiff shall elect to forgo a new trial on damages, the judgment for $40,000, as specified above, shall stand AFFIRMED. Circuit Rule 18 shall not apply.

A true Copy:
Teste:

Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JEFFREY WATTS,

Plaintiff,

No. 82 C 4593 vs.

HOWARD PETERS, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

On January 22, 1982, Jeffrey Watts (Watts) suffered a severe injury to his left leg and hip while an inmate at the Illinois Youth Center located in St. Charles, Illinois (IYC-St. Charles or St. Charles). He brought this suit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 (section 1983) alleging that several state employees who worked at IYC-St. Charles violated his right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. The complaint asserted that another inmate, Derrick Greaves (Greaves), attacked Watts and that defendants were deliberately indifferent to the danger of the attack.

After a four-day trial, a jury returned five separate verdicts, one against each defendant in the amount of $40,000. Defendants move for clarification of the judgment and for a judgment notwithstanding the verdict or, in the alternative, a new trial.

I. *Factual Background*

Watts arrived at IYC-St. Charles on July 21, 1981. Approximately three to four hundred youth criminal offenders live there. At the time, he had just turned fifteen and weighed between 120 and 130 pounds. Watts testified at

trial that, after he arrived, he learned that many of the inmates considered themselves members of gangs. These gangs allegedly held meetings, recruited new members, and communicated with hand signals. Watts asserted throughout trial that he never joined a gang although several tried to recruit him.

Derrick Greaves arrived at St. Charles on November 25, 1981. Officials transferred Greaves to IYC-St. Charles from the minimum security prison at Valley View, Illinois because of his aggressive behavior at Valley View. IYC-St. Charles is designated a medium/maximum security facility. In late 1981 and early 1982, Greaves was about 5′ 7″ tall and weighed approximately 155 pounds. Testimony at trial indicated that Greaves considered himself "chief" of the Black Gangster Disciples, one of the gangs at IYC-St. Charles.

The residents of IYC-St. Charles live in cottages. When residents arrive, administrators assign them to a cottage according to their disposition and background. One of these cottages, Roosevelt Cottage, is a higher security building used to segregate difficult residents. Watts and Greaves lived in Pierce Cottage.

Employees called youth supervisors oversee the residents. These youth supervisors take regular head counts, conduct residents to and from meals and classes, record daily logs reflecting each resident's behavior, and administer discipline. Four of the five defendants, Althea Brown (Brown), Geri Cejka (Cejka), James Laurant (Laurant), and Steven Vanjoske (Vanjoske), served as youth supervisors during the period relevant to Watts' complaint. The fifth defendant, Barry Steele (Steele), acted as a "team leader" in charge of supervising the Teen Center, a recreational facility for the residents.

On January 22, 1982, the residents of Pierce Cottage assembled outside the cafeteria after lunch. Brown and Vanjoske were taking a head count before leading the residents back to the cottage. The testimony at trial conflicted about what happened next. Several residents began

running over the field between the cafeteria and Pierce. Watts was running across the field when he suddenly found himself on the ground with Greaves on top of him. Testimony indicated that Greaves got up and "growled" while Watts writhed in pain on the ground. An ambulance took him to the hospital. Watts claimed that Greaves attacked him; defendants argued that Watts slipped on ice.

The theory of plaintiff's case was that Greaves had threatened Watts at least four times before January 22, 1982 and that, although aware of these threats, the defendants took no action to protect Watts. The four defendants other than Barry Steele overheard disputes between Watts and Greaves in which Greaves referred to Watts as a "shorty" who "would get [his] . . . one day." Transcript (February 13, 1984) at 15 [hereinafter Tr.]. Steele supposedly became aware of the danger to Watts through his knowledge of Greaves' record, his opportunity to observe Greaves' behavior, and his recognition that Watts was smaller than other residents. Steele testified that he repeatedly asked Watts about how Watts was getting along and that Watts never appeared fearful. The defendants maintained that they were unaware of any extraordinary animosity between Watts and Greaves.

At trial, all the defendants, the plaintiff, and many other witnesses testified. Throughout trial, defendants' counsel emphasized that the jury must consider each defendant separately. The jury had to determine that each of the five defendants showed the deliberate indifference that created liability. Accordingly, the court modified instructions and provided the jury separate verdict forms to ensure that the jury evaluated each defendant separately.

II. *Discussion*

A. *Motion to Clarify Judgment*

Before the court determines whether it should overturn the jury verdicts, it must decide what the verdicts mean. The motion to clarify judgment raises two issues. The motion argues both that the jury meant only to award a total

of $40,000 and that, if the jury meant to award $200,000, the award was excessive. Defendants contend in the second case that the excessiveness of the award requires the court to interpret the jury verdicts as only awarding a total of $40,000. Whether the verdicts were excessive is an issue about whether the evidence was sufficient to support them. The court discusses the sufficiency of the evidence in its disposition of the judgment notwithstanding the verdict.

With respect to the first argument, the court remained cognizant throughout trial that the jury might find liability against a defendant because the defendant was joined with another who was liable. To counter this problem, the court explained to the jury how it had to consider each defendant separately. In particular, the court told the jury:

> Although there is more than one defendant in this action, it does not follow from that fact that if one is liable, all are liable. Each is entitled to a fair consideration of his own defense and is not to be prejudiced, by the fact, if it should become a fact, that you find against the others. The instructions govern the case as to each defendant, insofar as they are applicable to him, to the same effect as if he were the only defendant in the action, and regardless of whether reference is made to defendant or defendants, in the singular or plural form. You will decide each defendant's case separately as if each were a separate lawsuit.

See Defendants' Instruction No. 6.

In addition to offering this instruction, defendants' counsel suggested the use of separate jury verdicts. The court gave the jury separate verdict forms over the protestation of plaintiff's counsel that a general verdict for all defendants would be simpler. Tr. (Jury Instruction Conference) at 7. The court observed that "[t]hen each one will get some separate attention, which I guess they're each entitled to." *Id.* Ms. Black, one of defendants' two attorneys responded, "That is what we would prefer." *Id.*

Given this background, the court can read the verdicts in only one way. The court told the jury to consider each claim as if it were a separate lawsuit. The court reiterated that "[t]he instructions govern the case as to each defendant . . . to the same effect at if he were the only defendant in the action." With this directive, the court told the jury to disregard the other defendants and focus on each one individually and separately. As the jury considered each defendant, it concluded that a $40,000 award compensated Watts for his damage. For each verdict, the jury disregarded the other four defendants and decided what amount of money compensated Watts for his loss. In each case, the jury settled on a $40,000 award. The court will vacate its earlier order and enter a judgment against the defendants holding them jointly and severally liable for $40,000. Once Watts receives $40,000, the judgment will compensate him for his loss.

B. *Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict*

Defendants move for judgment notwithstanding the verdict for many different reasons. Defendants' arguments fall into five categories:

(1) As a matter of law, defendants' failure to protect Watts amounted, at most, to negligence outside the scope of §1983.

(2) The evidence failed to support Watts' contention that defendants were aware of the safety threat posed by Greaves.

(3) The evidence failed to support the size of the jury verdict.

(4) The court erred by admitting evidence of gang activity at IYC-St. Charles.[1]

---

[1] The court fails to see how it can enter judgment notwithstanding the verdict because it erred in admitting evidence or instructing the jury. A new trial motion would be more appropriate. Never-

(Footnote continued on following page)

(5) When the court instructed the jury, it overemphasized damages, failed to give a good faith instruction, and misstated the law regarding knowledge and intent.[2]

"[A] court should sparingly enter judgments n.o.v." *Clemons v. Mitsui O.S.K. Lines*, 596 F.2d 746, 748 (7th Cir. 1979), *cert. denied*, 451 U.S. 969 (1981); *See F.W. Hempel & Co. v. Metal World*, 721 F.2d 610, 613 (7th Cir. 1983). "[A] motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict . . . 'should be denied where the evidence, along with [the] inferences to be reasonably drawn therefrom, when viewed in the light most favorable to the party opposing such motion, is such that reasonable men in a fair and impartial exercise of their judgment may reach different conclusions.' " *Clemons*, 596 F.2d at 748 (quoting *Hohmann v. Packard Instrument Company*, 471 F.2d 815, 819 (7th Cir. 1973)). This standard implies that the court should avoid basing a judgment notwithstanding the verdict on a disagreement with the jury about credibility. *See Clemons*, 596 F.2d at 748.

1. *Standard of Fault*

Cases involving a failure to protect trace their roots to *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976), in which the Supreme Court held that "deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of prisoners constitutes the 'unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain,' . . . proscribed by the Eighth Amendment." *See, e.g., State Bank of St. Charles v. Camic*, 712 F.2d 1140, 1145-46 (7th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 104 S. Ct. 491 (1984); *Little v. Walker*, 552 F.2d 193, 197 (7th Cir. 1977), *cert. denied*, 435 U.S. 932 (1978). "[T]he

---

[1] *continued*
theless, since defendants raised these grounds in their judgment n.o.v. motion, the court discusses the issues in this portion of the opinion. The court, however, applies the standards governing new trial motions discussed on pages 25-26.

[2] *See supra* note 3.

'deliberate indifference' standard of *Estelle* is met only if there were a strong likelihood, rather than a mere possibility, that violence would occur." *Camic*, 712 F.2d at 1146. " '[A] guard does not have to believe to a moral certainty that one inmate intends to attack another at a given place at a time certain before that officer is obligated to take steps to prevent such an assault.' " *Id.* (quoting *Vun Cannon v. Breed*, 391 F. Supp. 1371 (N.D. Cal. 1975)). " 'But, on the other hand, he must have more than a mere suspicion that an attack will occur.' " *Camic*, 712 F.2d at 1146. "[E]ven though Section 1983 embodies no state of mind requirement, . . . the Eighth Amendment does." *Id.* (citations omitted).

An isolated assault can constitute a deprivation of eighth amendment rights if guards have enough information to realize that an attack is likely to occur. For example, in *Redmond v. Baxley*, 475 F. Supp. 1111, 1114-15, 1116-17 (E.D. Mich. 1979), three inmates threatened a diabetic prisoner staying in the hospital infirmary. He reported these threats to infirmary personnel. The personnel ignored the repeated threats. Hours later, the inmates raped the plaintiff. Evidence indicated that several defendants had been aware of how pervasive homosexual rape was in the prison.

A jury awarded $130,000, and the district court refused to vacate the award. The court held that "[i]f the defendants' conduct is flagrantly culpable, then the mere failure to protect an inmate on a *single occasion* can constitute a deprivation of constitutional rights giving rise to a claim under §1983." 475 F. Supp. at 1117. "The import of pervasive prison violence is that such circumstances would be a basis to infer knowledge, and thus culpability, on the part of a defendant prison official." *Id.*

Applying these principles to the evidence presented, the court cannot find that Watts' claim fails as a matter of law. The defendants allegedly knew of the existence of gangs at St. Charles and, in particular, knew either that Greaves threatened Watts or was so aggressive that the

danger of attack was great. Knowing these facts, the defendants, as a matter of law, could have known enough to be on notice that Greaves posed a serious threat to Watts' safety. If aware of these facts, defendants' inaction could have been more than negligent.

2. *Sufficiency of the Evidence on Liability*

Most of defendants' memorandum in support of these motions is an elaborate argument that the jury made a mistake in evaluating whose story was more believable. With respect to the defendants other than Barry Steele, the memorandum argues that none of the four defendants could have overheard the threats because they were too far away or were occupied with other chores. Barry Steele supposedly should escape liability because he had no way of knowing about the threats. In addition, plaintiff never complained to any defendant about the threats to his safety.

With respect to the verdicts against Brown, Cejka, Laurant, and Vanjoske, the court cannot substitute its judgment for that of the jury. Watts introduced enough evidence from which the jury could reasonably infer that each of these four defendants knew of Greaves' animosity towards Watts and Greaves' intentions to get Watts:

Althea Brown: Watts testified that Brown was on duty one morning when the residents of Pierce Cottage lined up for breakfast. Watts ended up first in line. Greaves told Watts that Greaves went first because Greaves was in charge of the cottage. Greaves allegedly said, " 'You're lucky your a shorty and one day you're going to get yours.' " Tr. (February 13, 1984) at 14-15.

Brown asserts that she never overheard this threat, in part because she was supervising twenty-eight residents. Nevertheless, the jury could have disregarded her testimony and inferred from Watts' testimony that she overheard the threat. Coupled with knowledge that gang loyalties led to violence in the facility, Brown could have known enough to show the necessary deliberate indiffer-

ence. At trial, she testified that she was aware of no gang activity that went unpunished at St. Charles. She appeared knowledgeable in general, however, about gangs and their activities. Given the other reasonable testimony evidencing extensive gang activity at St. Charles and Brown's knowledge of gang behavior, her denials of gang activity may have rung hollow and undermined her credibility.

Geri Cejka: Watts testified that Cejka witnessed a fight between Watts and Greaves over a card game. Although Watts was hesitant and uncertain on cross-examination, he stuck to his story that Cejka was on duty and in the same room as Watts and Greaves during the argument. Cejka herself agreed that she disciplined both boys on another occasion for a similar argument.

When Cejka testified, Watts' counsel impeached her by reading from a letter in which she referred to Greaves as a "heavy." She wrote the letter shortly after the January 22nd incident, but the jury could have inferred that she based her opinion in the letter on activity that took place before the incident.[3] Tr. (February 14, 1984) at 50. She explained that [illegible] "heavy," she meant that Greaves was "bossy" and "wa[illegible] his way all the time." *Id.* at 49-51, 59-60. This statement by itself indicated that she considered Greaves to be overly aggressive. The jury could also have decided that "heavy" implied that Greaves was dangerous and that Cejka's belittling of this comment hurt her credibility. If the jury believed Watts' story about Cejka's involvement, she clearly had enough knowledge to conclude that Greaves would give the "shorty" Watts "his."

James Laurant: Watts testified that Laurant was present for a threat that took place on the grass outside the cafeteria. Laurant argued that he was talking to students some distance away. In addition, Watts testified that he

---

[3] The court refused to admit the letter into evidence, but allowed counsel to use it for impeachment purposes. *E.g.*, Tr. (February 14, 1984) at 54.

never told Laurant about the threat or about his fear of Greaves. Again, the jury could have reasonably concluded that, even though taking to other students, Laurant overheard the threat. Since Greaves was much larger than Watts, witnessing such a threat could have alerted Laurant to the danger Greaves posed to Watts.

Steven Vanjoske: Plaintiff's testimony was that Vanjoske was on duty during two of the alleged threats. For one of the threats, he was at the hospital with another resident. The jury could not conclude that he overheard this threat. During the second threat, he was present taking a head count of the Pierce Cottage residents. Although he claims he never overheard the threat, the jury could have inferred from Watts' testimony that Vanjoske heard it.

All defendants argue that Watts never told them about the threats. The Constitution imposes no requirement that a prisoner complain to his captors to put them on notice. The circumstances surrounding a prisoner's captivity can alert guards to a danger more forcefully than the prisoner himself. In this case, Watts contended that he was not afraid to fight Greaves, but he always sensed that he had "to watch [his] . . . back against [Greaves]." Tr. (February 13, 1984) at 46. The testimony impressed the court that residents are reluctant to admit fear because such admission will show weakness and compromise a resident's respect among his fellow inmates. This reluctance will not conjure up section 1983 liability without other warnings to prison guards, but it reasonably explains silence in the face of threats.

The verdict against Barry Steele is different. He is the one defendant who had no opportunity to overhear the alleged threats. He served as a team leader in charge of overseeing the central recreation facility at IYC-St. Charles. In this position, he had access to residents' disciplinary files and had authority to segregate dangerous residents. Testimony indicated that Steele took a particular interest in Watts because Steele noticed that Watts was smaller than other residents.

Watts contended that, because of Steele's duties and responsibilities, familiarity with gang activity, and Watts' smaller size, Steele was aware of the danger to Watts. The record lacks evidence about whether Steele knew that Watts resisted joining a gang. Steele, however, acknowledged Watts' smaller size. Steele had daily contact with almost all the residents.

Based on the record, the court must vacate the jury verdict and grant Steele a judgment notwithstanding the verdict. The record lacks any evidence that Steele knew about Greaves' dislike for Watts. Steele had no indication from Watts himself or from threats or disciplinary records that Greaves was out to get Watts. Both Steele and Watts testified that Steele asked Watts several times about how he was adjusting to St. Charles. In fact, Steele took a particular interest in Watts because Steele was concerned about his smaller size. In contrast to the deliberate indifference required under *Estelle*, Steele took steps to see if Watts needed more help. Given this interest and Steele's inquiries, he still had no reason to consider Greaves a threat to Watts. Plaintiff introduced nothing that indicates Greaves' disciplinary file contained enough information to notify Steele of a danger to Watts. Without something alerting Steele to a threat to Watts, the jury's verdict lacks support.

The court granted a directed verdict in favor of another defendant, Barbara Frederiksen, who was also in an advisory role. The court directed a verdict because she had no reason to know that Watts was in danger. Similarly, Steele, even with his more personal relationship with Watts, had no notice of a threat. The court concludes that it should have granted a directed verdict for Steele and now grants his a judgment notwithstanding the verdict.

3. *Sufficiency of the Evidence on Damages*

Defendants argue that a total judgment of $200,000 would be excessive, unreasonable, and unsupported by the evidence. Considering the court's interpretation of the ver-

dicts, it need only consider whether the evidence supported a $40,000 judgment. Throughout this case, defendants' counsel agreed that a serious injury occurred. They offered no evidence on the issue of damages.

Once liability is established, a proper damage award should compensate plaintiff for losses caused by the violative acts. *See, e.g., Redmond*, 475 F. Supp. at 1121-22, Defendants' Jury Instruction No. 25. Watts and other witnesses testified about the extreme pain that he experienced after the accident. A physician who treated Watts detailed the permanent damage to the hip joint and the limited prospects of corrective surgery. Watts described his life at home and how the injury disrupted his family life. Given that the injury permanently and severely impaired a fifteen year old's ability to walk and run, the court finds that a $40,000 judgment is reasonable.

4. *Evidence of Gang Activity*

Defendants assert that the court erred by admitting evidence about gang activity because nothing indicates that the attack was gang-related. This argument fails. The existence of gangs and pervasive gang activity could contribute to defendants' awareness of a danger of violence. *See Redmond*, 475 F. Supp. at 1117.

In addition, evidence indicated that the attack could have been gang-related. Greaves considered himself a gang chief. Watts' independence undermined his authority. Watts testified that he never joined a gang and that he challenged Greaves' authority in food lines when Greaves considered himself to be the person who ran the cottage. Tr. (February 13, 1984) at 14-15. Greaves testified that "Jeff Watts was messing with some of [his] . . . folks." Tr. (February 14, 1984) at 20.[4] The defendants allegedly

---

[4] Greaves testified as follows:

Q: Did you make any threats to Jeffrey Watts prior to January 22, 1982?

(Footnote continued on following page)

heard threats that resulted from Greaves dislike of Watts. Gang related problems may have fueled this dislike. The evidence of gang activity was therefore relevant to whether Greaves ever threatened Watts.[5]

Defendants also assert without citation that the court admitted evidence that Greaves was disciplined over twenty times after the incident. The court attempted to exclude all evidence of Greaves' behavior after the incident. *E.g.*, Tr. (February 13, 1984) at 11, 17, 20, 22. At one point, the court chastised plaintiff's counsel for trying to offer evidence about post-incident conduct. Tr. (February 14, 1984) at 3-4. The court is unaware of any evidence actually admitted about Greaves' post-incident disciplinary record. Without documentation, defendants' assertion fails.

5. Jury Instructions

Defendants object to two of the court's damage instructions. Plaintiff's Instructions No. 7 and No. 8 dealt with damages as did Defendants' Instruction No. 24A. Defen-

---

[4] *continued*

A: No, sir.

Q: You never had an argument with him?

A: Slight confrontation.

Q: What's a slight confrontation?

A: He was in the hallway and the problem was Jeff Watts was—at the time when I was—Jeff Watts was messing with some of our folks and they came back to me and they told me what was going on and they told me they was going to move out on Jeff Watts. I told them, "Don't do that. Just keep a cool head. I'll talk with him."

Tr. (February 14, 1984) at 20.

[5] Also, defendants contended that the incident on January 22, 1982 was an accident, but Watts asserted that Greaves attacked him. Watts claimed that his independence threatened Greaves' authority. Therefore, to help it determine whether Greaves attacked Watts, the jury properly heard evidence about gang activity.

dants argue that the court overemphasized damages when it gave all three of these instructions and encouraged the jury to bestow a windfall on plaintiff. Plaintiff's Instruction No. 7 discussed what standards the jury could use to calculate damages. At the instruction conference, defendants' counsel objected to Plaintiff's Instruction No. 7 because it failed to explain that a defendant had to cause the damage. Tr. (Jury Instruction Conference) at 13, 24. The court noted that another instruction cured this problem, *see* Defendants' Instruction No. 24, and counsel agreed to Plaintiff's Instruction No. 7. *See* Tr. (Jury Instruction Conference) at 13.[6]

The court gave Plaintiff's Instruction No. 8 in addition to Defendants' Instruction No. 24A because the latter instruction failed to fully explain the elements of damage for which the jury could compensate Watts.[7] Therefore, the damage instructions were not repetitive.

---

[6] The record reads:

> THE COURT: 6 given. 7.
>
> Well, this instruction—let me hear from counsel for the defendants.
>
> MS. BLACK: Just a moment, your Honor.
>
> THE COURT: Are you objecting or not?
>
> MS. BLACK: I think we would object unless it were modified by adding the statement that they have to find the defendants caused injury before they award damages.
>
> THE COURT: There is an instruction to that effect, or there will be. There is one, "Unless you find liability you will have no occasion for damages."
>
> MS. LISCHER: That's in ours.
>
> THE COURT: You have no objection otherwise, right? Given, if that's the case.
>
> Plaintiff's 8 . . .

Tr. (Jury Instruction Conference) at 13.

[7] The record also lacks any indication that counsel objected to Plaintiff's Instruction 8. *Compare* Tr. (Jury Instruction Conference) at 13-14 with *id.* at 20. Therefore, even if the instructions were repetitive, defendants waived their objection.

Next, defendants object to Plaintiff's Instruction No. 4. The court proposed to give the instruction as follows:

> The means of knowledge are ordinarily the equivalent in law to knowledge. So, if it appears from the evidence in the case that a person had information which would lead a reasonably prudent person to make inquiry through which he would usually learn certain facts, then this person may be found to have had actual knowledge of those facts, the same as if he had made such inquiry and had actually learned such facts.
>
> That is to say, the law will charge a person with notice and knowledge of whatever he would have learned, upon making such inquiry as it would have been reasonable to expect him to make under the circumstances.
>
> Knowledge of notice may also be established by circumstantial evidence. If it appears that a certain condition has existed for a substantial period of time, and that the Defendants had regular opportunities to observe the condition, then you may draw the inference that he had knowledge of the condition.
>
> However, in any case, you must reach the conclusion that the information did in fact reach the defendant involved.

The court added the last sentence after defendants' counsel objected to the instruction. Tr. (Jury Instruction Conference) at 12. Regrettably, when the court read the instructions to the jury, it omitted the last sentence. Defendants' counsel alerted the court to its error. The court reconvened the jury and read the correct instruction to the jury with the admonition that they should not give undue emphasis to any instruction or portion of one, in particular to the added sentence. Defendants' counsel then made no objection.

With the added sentence, the instruction clarifies that, ordinarily, constructive knowledge is enough and circum-

stantial evidence can establish knowledge but that, in this case, the jury had to find actual knowledge. Evidence of constructive knowledge or circumstantial evidence of knowledge is probative if other evidence establishes that the defendant did in fact receive the information. Plaintiff's Instruction No. 4 (modified). The court remains convinced that this is a correct statement of the law.[8]

The court's admonition reduced the risk of prejudice from the initial omission of the last sentence. More important, during their deliberations the jury received copies of the instructions. Defendants' counsel reviewed the instructions before the jury received them and entered no objection. With the written instructions before them, it is unlikely that the jurors gave any one instruction undue emphasis. At most, the omission was harmless error.

Defendants object to Plaintiff's Instruction No. 10. That instruction provided:

> The fact that a Defendant or Defendants had no specific intent or purpose to deprive the Plaintiff of his civil rights will not absolve the Defendant or Defendants from liability if they did in fact deprive the Plaintiff of those rights.

This instruction explained to the jury that, to find liability, it did not have to conclude that the purpose of defendants' inaction was to deprive Watts of his constitutional rights.

As explained in *Redmond*, a prison guard does not have to intend to deprive a person of his constitutional rights. 475 F. Supp. at 1118. Reckless conduct is enough. *Id.* "[D]eliberate indifference may involve taking risks, rather than intending results." *Id.* The court in *Westlake v. Lucas*, 537 F.2d 857, 860 n.3 (6th Cir. 1976), stated that

---

[8] The only claim that depended on a theory of constructive knowledge was the one against Barry Steele who had access to disciplinary files. The other defendants all allegedly had actual knowledge of the threat to Watts. Since the court grants Steele judgment, any error associated with this instruction was harmless.

"[a] complaint need not allege that prison officials consciously sought to inflict pain on a prisoner by withholding treatment." In *Little v. Walker*, 552 F.2d at 198 n.8, the Seventh Circuit held that "either . . . actual intent or recklessness" will provide a sufficient foundation for a section 1983 claim.

Intent in the constitutional sense means something different than some malicious purpose to deprive constitutional rights. This instruction explained that to the jury.

Defendants argue that the court erred by denying them a good faith instruction. They agreed that *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800 (1982), established the applicable standard. Defendants proposed the following instruction:

> The law provides that public officials may assert a qualified immunity from liability in a civil rights suit for actions undertaken in their official capacities.
>
> If you view the defendants' actions objectively, and find that such actions were done in good faith and within the scope of their authority as public officials, you may find them liable only if you determine that: a clearly established constitutional right of the plaintiff was violated and that the defendant knew or should have known that their conduct violated that right.

Defendants' Instruction No. 26. This misstates the law. *Harlow* established two alternative tests, not one two-pronged test. The case held that defendants could establish a qualified immunity by showing *either* that the constitutional right involved was not clearly established, 457 U.S. at 818, *or* that, if clearly established, the defendant, because of extraordinary circumstances, neither knew nor should have known of the legal standard that governed how much protection he or she had to provide the plaintiff, *id.* at 819.

The court refused to give defendants' good faith instruction because the record lacked any evidence on the issue. The constitutional right to protection from attacks by

fellow inmates goes back at least five years before the attack in this case. The law was clear. Therefore, defendants had to introduce evidence that because, of extraordinary circumstances, they "neither knew nor should have known of the relevant standard." *Harlow*, 457 F.2d at 819. Defendants submitted no evidence that they misunderstood what standard governed their conduct. Throughout the case, they acknowledged their duty to protect Watts. They never claimed that the incident arose because they were confused about whether they had to segregate Watts from Greaves. Without any evidence that knowledge of the standard was in doubt, a good faith instruction would only have confused the jury and prejudiced plaintiff.

C. *Motion for New Trial*

On a motion for new trial, the judge "has a duty to set aside a verdict and grant a new trial even though it is supported by substantial evidence, 'if he is of the opinion that the verdict is against the clear weight of the evidence, or is based upon evidence which . . . will result in a miscarriage of justice.' " *Wyatt v. Interstate Ocean Transport*, 623 F.2d 888, 891 (4th Cir. 1980) (quoting *Williams v. Nichols*, 266 F.2d 389, 392 (4th Cir. 1959)). The court can weigh the evidence and consider the credibility of witnesses. *Id.* at 891.

Defendants claim that they are entitled to a new trial for all the reasons raised by their motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict. With respect to the defendants other than Barry Steele, the court finds these reasons insufficient. Although these defendants vigorously dispute Watts' credibility and the plausibility of his story, a sharp credibility conflict should be resolved by the jury. *See Williams v. City of Valdosta*, 689 F.2d 964, 974 (11th Cir. 1982) ("[W]hen the trial involves simple issues, highly disputed facts, and there is an absence of 'pernicious occurrences' trial courts should be considerably less inclined to disturb a jury verdict."). This court does not find that

allowing the verdicts to stand against these defendants will perpetrate a miscarriage of justice. The court can examine the witnesses' credibility, but it finds none of Watts' evidence unbelievable enough to usurp the jury's judgment.

III. *Conclusion*

In accordance with the above, the court grants defendants' motion to clarify the judgment. The earlier judgment is vacated. Defendants Brown, Cejka, Laurant and Vanjoske are together liable to Watts for no more than a total of $40,000. Each one, however, is liable to Watts for up to $40,000 until the judgment is satisfied. The court grants Barry Steele judgment notwithstanding the verdict, but denies the other defendants' motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict and new trial. Plaintiff shall submit a new bill of costs to reflect the court's disposition of Barry Steele's motion.

ENTER:

/s/ Bernard M. Decker
United States District Judge

DATED: July 2, 1984.

IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Nos. 85-1010, 85-1053, 85-1084, 85-1095

JUNIOR RAY DUCKWORTH, et al.,
Plaintiffs-Appellees, Cross-Appellants,

v.

GAYLE FRANZEN, et al.,
Defendants-Appellants, Cross-Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Illinois, Alton Division.
No. 80 C 5057—**William L. Beatty**, *Judge*.

ARGUED OCTOBER 31, 1985—DECIDED DECEMBER 17, 1985

Before BAUER, POSNER, and EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judges.*

POSNER, *Circuit Judge.* In November 1979 a bus used to transport prisoners between Illinois prisons caught fire from unknown causes. When the fire broke out, the 35 prisoners in the bus were in handcuffs, with all the prisoners on each side of the aisle being joined together by a chain running through the handcuffs. For reasons of security all exits but the front door of the bus had been sealed and there was a metal screen (like a mesh fence), probably locked (but the record is not clear on this), between the passenger area and the front door. When the bus filled with dense smoke each group of prisoners tried

to rise and make its way to the front exit, but only one prisoner (who had managed to slip out of his handcuffs) succeeded in getting out, and a guard thrust him back into the bus. Eventually guards equipped with gas masks cut through the chains and brought the prisoners out. One prisoner died from the ordeal. Others suffered serious, and in at least one case permanent, lung injury. Twenty-one of the injured prisoners brought suit against three prison officials and three guards under section 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1871 (now 42 U.S.C. § 1983), charging that by failing to take effective precautions against the consequences of a fire on the bus the defendants had visited cruel and unusual punishment on the plaintiffs in violation of the Eighth Amendment, which has been held applicable to the states under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The complaint included a pendent claim against these six defendants for negligence and a diversity claim based on products liability against a seventh defendant, the manufacturer of the bus.

The district judge severed the claim against the bus company, and it remains in the district court, awaiting trial. He dismissed the pendent claim. The civil rights claim was tried to a jury, which awarded damages totaling $561,000 (including punitive damages) against three of the defendants—Franzen, the head of the Illinois prison system at the time of the fire; Wolff, the then warden of Joliet prison, the distribution point for prisoners entering the Illinois prison system and the place where the bus was kept; and Hert, the then director of security at Joliet—but exonerated the three guards who had been in charge of the bus when the fire occurred. Although the judgment is not final in the sense of winding up the entire litigation—for the plaintiffs' claim against the bus company has yet to be tried—the judge quite properly has certified the judgment for an immediate appeal under Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. It disposes, with finality in the district court, of the claims against the other defendants, and they should not have to wait until the case against the bus company is concluded to get a definitive determination of their liability.

The three defendants who were found liable argue mainly that the plaintiffs' suit is barred by the Eleventh Amendment and that in any event no reasonable jury could have found them guilty of inflicting cruel and unusual punishment. The plaintiffs, cross-appealing from the dismissal of the pendent claim, argue that the district judge was wrong to think it barred by the Eleventh Amendment, especially when the judge thought the Eleventh Amendment no bar to the civil rights claim. Several of the plaintiffs also challenge the jury's award of damages to them, as too low.

The defendants say they were sued in their official capacities, making this a suit against the state. If you believe that a state officer has violated your constitutional rights, you have a choice between suing the officer personally and suing the state. If you go the former route you don't have to worry about the Eleventh Amendment but do have to worry about various personal defenses, such as good-faith immunity; if you go the latter route you don't have to worry about personal defenses but may have to worry about the Eleventh Amendment. See *Kentucky v. Graham*, 105 S. Ct. 3099, 3105-06 (1985). A suit against an official in his official rather than individual capacity is a suit against the state. See *id.* at 3105; *Brandon v. Holt*, 105 S. Ct. 873, 878 (1985).

The complaint named Franzen "in his capacity as Director of the Illinois Department of Corrections," but Wolff and Hert merely as "Former Warden of the Joliet Correctional Center" and "Former Chief of Security" at Joliet, respectively, and the three guards just as "Officers of the Illinois Department of Corrections." The same designations appear in the part of the complaint that asks for damages. All this might seem to clinch the case for regarding the suit against Franzen, at least, as an official-capacity suit and hence barred by the Eleventh Amendment; for section 1983 did not abrogate the states' Eleventh Amendment immunity from damage suits, *Owen v. Lash*, 682 F.2d 648, 654 (7th Cir. 1982), and Illinois has not waived that immunity. Although the Eleventh Amend-

ment, read literally, forbids the federal courts to exercise jurisdiction over any suit by a citizen against a state, they may do so if the state consents, *Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781, 782 (1978) (per curiam)—a rare example of the conferral of subject-matter jurisdiction by consent.

Not only suing a defendant in his official capacity, but even just naming the defendant's office, raises a presumption that he is being sued only in his official capacity. See, e.g., *Kolar v. County of Sangamon*, 756 F.2d 564, 568-69 (7th Cir. 1985); *Wolf-Lillie v. Sonquist*, 699 F.2d 864, 869-70 and n. 12 (7th Cir. 1983). It suggests that the plaintiff is really after the employer, which is to say the state or a state agency. But the presumption cannot be conclusive in a system such as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure create, in which the complaint does not fix the plaintiff's rights but may be amended at any time to conform to the evidence. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(b); *Phillips v. Vandygriff*, 711 F.2d 1217, 1225 n. 9 (5th Cir. 1983). Whatever the plaintiffs may have had in mind when they named Franzen "in his capacity as Director" of the Illinois prison system, the case was tried as a suit against the defendants as individuals. This is shown most dramatically by the fact that the judge, at the defendants' request, instructed the jury that all of the defendants were being sued as individuals, that they were liable only for their personal acts or omissions to act, and that neither the State of Illinois nor the Illinois Department of Corrections was a defendant.

The defendants do not argue that the form of the complaint misled them. Bear in mind that Franzen resigned as Director of the Illinois Department of Corrections while the suit was in progress, while Wolff and Hert had already resigned from the offices named in the complaint. If the state attorney general's office, which represents state officials whether sued in their official or individual capacities, had thought this a suit against Franzen or Wolff or Hert in their official capacities, we do not understand why it did not move in either the district court or this court to substitute their successors in office as defen-

dants in their place. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d)(1); Fed. R. App. P. 43(c). We hold that substance trumps form and that all the defendants were sued in their individual capacities. That this issue may not recur we urge counsel for civil rights plaintiffs when they are suing a state officer in his individual capacity to say so plainly; and if in both his individual and official capacities to make that unmistakably clear, too. *Kolar v. County of Sangamon, supra*, 756 F.2d at 568-69.

But being sued in their individual capacities the defendants could be held liable only for their individual wrongdoing. Section 1983 does not recognize a doctrine of superiors' liability. *McKinnon v. City of Berwyn*, 750 F.2d 1383, 1390 (7th Cir. 1984). Such a doctrine would be analogous to respondeat superior, which makes the employer, as distinct from a superior employee, liable for an employee's tort—and which is also unavailable in suits under section 1983. *Monell v. New York City Dept. of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 691-94 (1978). So Franzen could not be held liable for the torts of his subordinates in the Department of Corrections. As there is no evidence of Franzen's individual wrongdoing—no evidence for example that he rewrote the guards' manual to eliminate some safety precaution in the event of fire—it may seem that the suit must really be against the office, and hence the state, not against the man. But the plaintiff is the master of his complaint. If he proceeds on a theory that he cannot substantiate factually, he is barred because of his failure of proof, not because another theory which he did not pursue is barred by an immunity. The plaintiffs charged Franzen with personal wrongdoing. Having utterly failed to prove that, they cannot get a judgment against him, but this conclusion has nothing to do with the Eleventh Amendment and does not resolve the liability of the other defendants.

An Illinois statute entitles state employees to be indemnified by the state for damages imposed on them for acts committed in the course of their state employment, unless the employee acted willfully or wantonly. Ill. Rev. Stat.

ch. 127, ¶ 1302 (d). The defendants argue that the statute makes this a suit against the state, because the state will end up footing the bill for any damage judgment against them. Yet every court that has considered this issue has rejected, rightly in our view, the argument that an indemnity statute brings the Eleventh Amendment into play. See, e.g., *Wilson v. Beebe*, 770 F.2d 578, 588 (6th Cir. 1985); *Demery v. Kupperman*, 735 F.2d 1139, 1146-49 (9th Cir. 1984); *Downing v. Williams*, 624 F.2d 612, 626 (5th Cir. 1980), vacated on other grounds, 645 F.2d 1226 (1981) (per curiam).

Forget about the fact that the statute does not require the state to indemnify for punitive damages (because awarded only for conduct that is willful or wanton, or much worse); for as a matter of fact the State of Illinois usually indemnifies its employees for such damages and we assume would do so here. Nevertheless the purpose of the Eleventh Amendment is only to protect the state against involuntary liability. If the state chooses to pick up the tab for its errant officers, its liability for their torts is voluntary. It is true that the burden of tort judgments against state employees may eventually come to rest on the state with or without indemnity. If the state doesn't indemnify its officers it may have to pay them higher salaries so that they can buy insurance that will do so. But this type of argument has never succeeded in getting the bar of the Eleventh Amendment extended to suits against state officers in their individual capacities, and anyway is unrelated to the indemnity statute. Moreover, it would be absurd if all a state had to do to put its employees beyond the reach of section 1983 and thereby make the statute ineffectual except against employees of local governments (local government is not protected by the Eleventh Amendment) was to promise to indemnify state employees for any damages awarded in such a suit.

The defendants' last argument under the Eleventh Amendment is that since state law requires the state to pay, and it has paid, the plaintiffs' medical expenses, this suit insofar as it seeks the recovery of such expenses as

an item of damages is really against the state. The opposite would be more nearly correct, once it is established that this is a suit against the defendants in their individual rather than official capacities. Insofar as the state has paid medical expenses incurred as a result of the defendants' wrongful acts, the state would have (but for the indemnity statute) a claim against the defendants to reimburse it. Its position would be akin to that of a coplaintiff, subrogated to so much of the plaintiffs' claim as seeks reimbursement for medical expenses that the state rather than the plaintiffs has actually borne.

The defendants' alternative argument against liability is that, even viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the plaintiffs, as of course we must do in appraising the argument, what they did could not reasonably be thought a violation of the Eighth Amendment. Negligence, perhaps; gross negligence—giving due regard for the jury's verdict—perhaps; but not cruel and unusual punishment. This is clear enough with regard to Franzen. Not having been personally involved in the security and safety measures regarding the bus, he is guilty at worst of neglect. But the other two appellants were personally and responsibly involved in securing the bus and in taking or failing to take measures to assure the safety of the prisoners transported on the bus. Their role is analogous to that of the police chief in *McKinnon v. City of Berwyn, supra*, 750 F.2d at 1391, who, having participated in conduct of his subordinates that led to the plaintiff's false arrest and brutal treatment, could be jointly liable with them for violating the plaintiff's civil rights. Still we must decide whether what Wolff and Hert did or failed to do amounted to the infliction of a cruel and unusual punishment.

The constitutional prohibition of "cruel and unusual punishments" apparently was intended, as the words suggest, merely to prohibit barbarous punishments—punishments having the character of torture, see Granucci, "*Nor Cruel and Unusual Punishments Inflicted:" The Original Meaning*, 57 Calif. L. Rev. 839, 840-42 (1969)—although the Supreme Court has interpreted the historical record

somewhat more broadly, see, e.g., *Ingraham v. Wright*, 430 U.S. 651, 664-67 (1977). And originally, of course, the prohibition was only against the federal government's inflicting such punishments, the Bill of Rights not being applicable to the states. But the Supreme Court has decided that freedom from cruel and unusual punishments is one of the liberties secured against state action by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and like freedom of speech one of those liberties a state cannot deprive a person of even if does so by impeccable procedures. See, e.g., *Robinson v. California*, 370 U.S. 660 (1962); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976).

Even so, the plaintiffs could get nowhere if the words "unusual" and "punishment" were given anything like their normal meanings. The infliction of punishment is a deliberate act intended to chastise or deter. This is what the word means today; it is what it meant in the eighteenth century; Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755) defines "punishment" as "Any infliction or pain imposed in vengeance of a crime." If a guard decided to supplement a prisoner's official punishment by beating him, this would be punishment, and "cruel and unusual" because the Supreme Court has interpreted the term to forbid unauthorized and disproportionate, as well as barbarous, punishments. See *Ingraham v. Wright*, *supra*, 430 U.S. at 664-67, summarizing the case law. But if the guard accidentally stepped on the prisoner's toe and broke it, this would not be punishment in anything remotely like the accepted meaning of the word, whether we consult the usage of 1791, or 1868, or 1985. Again, if a prisoner has a serious illness and the prison staff, though fully aware of the gravity of the illness, refuses to treat it and the prisoner dies, this could well be deemed, and under current case law would be deemed, the infliction of punishment. See, e.g., *Joseph v. Brierton*, 739 F.2d 1244, 1246 (7th Cir. 1984). But if the staff merely misdiagnoses the illness and thinking it trivial does not treat it, and the prisoner dies, this would not be punishment in any accepted meaning of the word even if the diagnosis

was negligent. See, e.g., *Benson v. Cady*, 761 F.2d 335, 341 (7th Cir. 1985) (dictum).

These are the easy cases; the hard ones are where the behavior of the prison's staff is somewhere in between careless and deliberate infliction of suffering; and we must consider where the line is drawn. The reigning formula of course is "deliberate indifference," e.g., *Jones v. Morris*, No. 84-2639, slip op. at 5 (7th Cir. Nov. 27, 1985), but the term is not self-defining. Indeed, like other famous oxymorons in law—"deliberate speed" for example or "substantive due process"—it evades rather than expresses precise meaning.

The usual intermediate category in law between negligence and deliberateness is recklessness; and reflection on the commonest legal meanings of "reckless" may point us to a solution of our conundrum. One usage, common in tort law, essentially equates recklessness to gross negligence. See Prosser and Keeton on the Law of Torts 214 (5th ed. 1984). If negligence under Judge Learned Hand's formula in *United States v. Carroll Towing Co.*, 159 F.2d 169, 173 (2d Cir. 1947), and in later cases such as *United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. v. Jadranska Slobodna Plovidba*, 683 F.2d 1022, 1026 (7th Cir. 1982), means that the cost of averting an accident is less, even if just a hair's breadth less, than the expected cost of the accident that would be averted, recklessness in the sense of gross negligence means that the disparity between the cost of prevention and the expected accident cost is great. A quite different sense of recklessness, familiar from criminal law, is the sense in which for example a wrongful, deliberate, and very dangerous act which results in death though death was not intended may be downgraded to second-degree murder, with first-degree murder being reserved for deliberate homicide. A classic example is where the defendant chokes his victim, intending to injure him seriously but not to kill him, but death results. See *Commonwealth v. Marshall*, 287 Pa. 512, 135 Atl. 301 (1926); LaFave & Scott, Handbook on Criminal Law 568 (1972). The defendant has deliberately committed an act

that is at once socially costless to avoid (by not choking his victim in the first place) and highly dangerous. So he is severely punished, for an act that was deliberate and wrongful as well as for a consequence that was lethal though unintended. As this example suggests, recklessness in criminal law implies an act so dangerous that the defendant's knowledge of the risk can be inferred. See Perkins & Boyce, Criminal Law 849-51 (3d ed. 1982).

If the word "punishment" in cases of prisoner mistreatment is to retain a link with normal usage, the infliction of suffering on prisoners can be found to violate the Eighth Amendment only if that infliction is either deliberate, or reckless in the criminal law sense. Gross negligence is not enough. Unlike criminal recklessness it does not import danger so great that knowledge of the danger can be inferred; and we remind that the "indifference" to the prisoner's welfare must be "deliberate," e.g., *Estelle v. Gamble*, *supra*, 429 U.S. at 104; *Jones v. Morris*, *supra*, slip op. at 5-6, implying such knowledge. Although some cases contain language more suggestive of the tort definition of recklessness than of the criminal law definition, see, e.g., *Benson v. Cady*, *supra*, 761 F.2d at 339-40; *Estate of Davis v. Johnson*, 745 F.2d 1066, 1071 (7th Cir. 1984); *State Bank v. Camic*, 712 F.2d 1140, 1146 (7th Cir. 1983), they are cases where the prisoner had failed to prove recklessness even in the tort sense, and it was not important therefore whether he would have had to prove even more in order to win the case.

The cases where a prisoner complaining of mistreatment has been allowed to recover damages under the Eighth Amendment in fact involve recklessness in the strong sense. For example, if a prisoner tells the prison doctor that he is allergic to penicillin, but the doctor injects him with penicillin anyway and the prisoner has a severe reaction, the doctor is guilty of having inflicted a cruel and unusual punishment; that was our case of *Thomas v. Pate*, 493 F.2d 151, 158 (7th Cir.), vacated and remanded on other grounds under the name of *Cannon v. Thomas*, 419 U.S. 813 (1974) (per curiam). But if before injecting him

the doctor merely fails to tell the prisoner what is in the syringe, and thus gives the prisoner no chance to alert him to a possible (and quite common) allergy, the doctor is not guilty of violating the Eighth Amendment even if it is a palpable act of medical malpractice to inject someone with penicillin without first asking him whether he is allergic. Cf. *Estelle v. Gamble*, *supra*, 429 U.S. at 107. In the first case the doctor knows there is a great danger, could avert it at trivial cost (though greater than in the case of reckless murder that we gave earlier), but instead ignores it. In the second case the doctor should know there is some danger, but he is inadvertent. Although it is conceivable if improbable that his inadvertence would be deemed unreasonable enough—given the trivial burden of inquiry—to make his conduct reckless in a tort sense, punishment cannot be inadvertent. Punishment implies at a minimum actual knowledge of impending harm easily preventable, so that a conscious, culpable refusal to prevent the harm can be inferred from the defendant's failure to prevent it. Such facts "as a history of accidents or a previous request for repairs that had fallen on deaf ears" are therefore important. *Jones v. Morris*, *supra*, slip op. at 5 n. 5.

In the present case, even if the defendants' conduct was negligent or even grossly negligent, a reasonable and properly instructed jury could not have found it sufficiently reckless to be called punishment. To begin with, the danger of a serious accident, though plain enough in retrospect, was not believed to be great and was not objectively so great that Wolff's and Hert's actual knowledge of the danger can be inferred. There had never been a fire on a prison bus in Illinois. This bus had been in service without incident for more than a year before the fire. The plaintiffs' able counsel presented no evidence of even a single instance in the history of this country (or for that matter any other country) of a fire on a prison bus or other vehicle in which someone was being transported under restraint. Obviously there have been such fires but they must be exceedingly rare.

Maybe no other bus has ever been so hard to get out of in an emergency as this one, but that is unlikely too. The security modifications that resulted in the sealing of the windows, roof hatch, and exits were copied from the buses that the Immigration and Naturalization Service uses to transport illegal aliens under arrest. Apparently none of those buses has ever been involved in an accident in which a prisoner was hurt because he had difficulty getting out of the bus. *McKinnon*, cited earlier, is illustrative of a number of cases where a prisoner was hurt by being banged against the inside walls of a speeding paddy wagon, see 750 F.2d at 1386, but that is an entirely different problem. The plaintiffs point out that the bus involved in the present case made long trips, while INS buses (maybe) operate mostly within cities, but we cannot see what difference that would make. It is the length of time a bus is in use rather than the length of the particular journey that counts in deciding whether the experience of the bus is comparable to that of some other bus, and there is no evidence that the INS uses its buses less than the Illinois prison authorities use theirs.

Although a manual prepared after the security modifications were made alludes to the possibility of fire, states truistically that "a fire which cannot be extinguished immediately should result in the orderly removal of residents [prisoners] from the bus," and adds somewhat ominously, "Under no circumstances should the restraining devices be removed unless a resident's life is in immediate danger," the defendants' foresight should not be the lever that raises their conduct from negligent to reckless. They realized that there could be a fire on the bus but given the absence of any known history of fires they naturally did not rate the danger high and therefore did not give much thought to the problems that might arise if there were a fire; other problems of prison administration must have seemed much more pressing. In particular they failed to realize that a large group of prisoners who were chained together might have difficulty getting out of the bus. While the chain itself was not fastened to the bus, if one

prisoner tripped on his way out—a likely occurrence in conditions of panic, fear, and in this case darkness caused by smoke (but the density of the smoke was hardly foreseeable)—the rest of the group would be stuck; and there were two groups. All this is clear in hindsight. But it was not foreseen. People often fail to foresee disasters of a kind that have not yet occurred and to take effective precautions against them, and ordinarily such lack of foresight is at worst negligence; it certainly is not recklessness in anything like the criminal law sense of the word.

Davis v. United States, 716 F.2d 418 (7th Cir. 1983), a case under the Federal Tort Claims Act, provides an instructive contrast. The plaintiff broke his neck when he dove into a lake in a federal wildlife refuge. The bottom of the lake had dangerous rock outcroppings near the shore. The government had failed to take effective steps to warn the public of the danger even though there had been five similar diving accidents in another and similar lake in the same wildlife refuge in the recent past. We held that the government's failure to warn had been willful and wanton (=grossly negligent) but not willful and malicious. Yet it was a stronger case for the plaintiff than the present case. Here no history of accidents conveyed an unmistakable warning that the expected accident cost if no further precautions were taken was very high. And while the plaintiffs argue that the statement in the manual about "immediate" danger to life being the only warrant for removing handcuffs puts too much emphasis on security relative to safety and thereby evinces a conscious indifference toward prisoners' lives, they are putting too much emphasis on one word; the passage as a whole suggests a concern for, rather than callousness toward, prisoners' safety.

Not only was the perceived danger not great but the means of averting it were not simple, obvious, or cheap. Six years after the accident it is still not clear what the defendants should have done if they had thought more carefully about the danger that materialized. They could have forgone the security modifications. But the modifica-

tions were in response to a long history of escapes from Illinois prison buses. Thirty-five felons are a dangerous concentration. They cannot be transported with safety to themselves, the community, the driver, or the guards unless they are manacled and the exits sealed. The modifications were reasonable. The question was what to do, given them, to minimize the danger that the prisoners might be trapped in an accident or a fire.

This is a difficult question, reminding us that "the problems that arise in the day-to-day operation of a corrections facility are not susceptible of easy solutions. Prison administrators therefore should be accorded wide-ranging deference in the adoption and execution of policies and practices that in their judgment are needed to preserve internal order and discipline and to maintain institutional security." *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 547 (1979). The plaintiffs tell us that after the accident the prison authorities put little plaques on the backs of the seats in the bus, telling the prisoners not to panic in the event of an accident or fire; this seems to us a meager palliative, unlikely to have had the slightest effect on what occurred on the day of the fire. The plaintiffs suggest that maybe a device could have been rigged by which the driver or a guard could push a button and release the chain and perhaps the sealed exits and windows. But the record contains no evidence concerning the feasibility, expense, or dangers of such a system (the danger, for example, that a prisoner would reach the button).

Maybe the prisoners shouldn't have been chained to one another. Maybe fewer prisoners should have been transported at one time. The plaintiffs do not press these points on us. Their principal suggestion is—fire drills. This we find impossible to visualize. The bus starts in Joliet and meanders about the state, dropping off prisoners at the various prisons to which they have been assigned after being processed at the intake center at Joliet and picking up prisoners who are being transferred to other prisons. The logic of the plaintiffs' argument is that every time the bus picked up a new passenger there would have to

be a new fire drill. Guards would have to surround the bus to make sure the prisoners didn't use the occasion of the fire drill to run away. Maybe, despite these objections, prison bus fire drills are a good idea but they are not so simple and obvious a one that the failure to have conducted them—before there had been an accident—convicts the defendants of a deliberate indifference to the safety of their charges. The record contains no evidence about precautions used by other prison systems. It is of course possible that the fault here lay not with the officials responsible for the security and safety arrangements of the bus but with the guards who reacted slowly to the fire and failed to release the chains that bound the prisoners in clumsy groups—not to mention the guard who forced one prisoner back into the bus. But the jury exonerated the guards and the plaintiffs have not appealed from that part of the judgment.

We know the cases in which prison officials have been ordered to take steps to remove fire hazards, and we acknowledge that in some of them little attention was paid to the question whether the hazards were so great as to amount to cruel and unusual punishment. See, e.g., *Hoptowit v. Spellman*, 753 F.2d 779, 783-84 (9th Cir. 1985); *Santana v. Collazo*, 714 F.2d 1172, 1183 (1st Cir. 1983); *Leeds v. Watson*, 630 F.2d 674, 675-76 (9th Cir. 1980); *Battle v. Anderson*, 564 F.2d 388, 395 (10th Cir. 1977). In others, however, this essential requirement for liability was properly stressed. See, e.g., *Shrader v. White*, 761 F.2d 975, 984-86 (4th Cir. 1985); *Ruiz v. Estelle*, 679 F.2d 1115, 1152-53 (5th Cir. 1982), modified, 688 F.2d 266, 267 (1982) (per curiam). The latter decisions (amongst which we include our recent decision in *French v. Owens*, No. 83-2280, slip op. at 15 (7th Cir. Nov. 26, 1985), where we said, "The eighth amendment does not constitutionalize the Indiana Fire Code") we consider better reasoned. But in any event the cases that involve equitable remedies against fire hazards in prisons are distinguishable from this case. Prison fires, as distinct from prison *bus* fires, are common and both their hazards and the necessary precautions

well known. A judgment of reckless disregard for prisoners' safety is therefore easier to make. And there is a difference between a suit to remove a fire hazard and a suit for damages after a fire has occurred. In the former case the filing of the suit puts the prison officials on notice of a potential hazard; and if the hazard is demonstrated, yet they refuse to do anything, maybe that is evidence of a reckless disregard for safety.

The district judge should have granted judgment for the defendants notwithstanding the jury's verdict; obviously the cross-appeal by the individual plaintiffs who complain that the damages the jury awarded were inadequate must be dismissed. The defendants' complaints about the jury instructions and evidentiary rulings are moot.

That leaves only the question whether the judge was right to dismiss the pendent claim. He thought it barred by the Eleventh Amendment. But if, as he and we believe, the civil rights claim was brought against the defendants in their individual capacities, we can think of no reason for believing that the pendent negligence claim was brought against them in their official capacities; nor do the defendants suggest any reason. The judge hinted that he might have dismissed the pendent claim anyway because the jury might be confused if it had to consider the defendants' liability under both the Eighth Amendment and the common law of negligence. But we do not understand this either. The plaintiff in a personal injury case will often allege different levels of culpability, ranging upward from negligence, in the hope of getting punitive as well as compensatory damages or of defeating defenses such as comparative or contributory negligence that are effective only against the lesser forms of culpability. This has never been thought a source of serious confusion. The almost complete factual overlap between the main and pendent claims in the present case makes this a natural case for the retention rather than relinquishment of pendent jurisdiction; and while the district judge has a broad discretion in making what amounts to a managerial judgment on whether to allow a plaintiff to bring one case

in federal court or force him to litigate his state claim in state court, we cannot uphold an exercise of discretion so flawed as the one before us.

But what to do about this is another question. Since we are ordering the federal claim dismissed, since pendent party jurisdiction cannot be used to reattach the pendent negligence claim to the plaintiffs' diversity claim against the bus company, *Hixon v. Sherwin-Williams Co.*, 671 F.2d 1005, 1007-09 (7th Cir. 1982), and since pendent claim jurisdiction should normally be relinquished when the federal claim is dismissed before trial, see *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966), it would seem that a remand to the district court to reconsider his ruling on pendent jurisdiction could have but one result: the dismissal of the pendent claim.

But two considerations argue against this result. The first, and lesser, is that where there has been a trial, considerations of judicial economy may support retention of the pendent claim for any further trial proceedings, as we said in *Cenco Inc. v. Seidman & Seidman*, 686 F.2d 449, 458-59 (7th Cir. 1982). But that was a case where the pendent as well as main claims had been tried once, and the question was whether the retrial was to be in federal or state court; even then we noted reasons for relinquishing pendent jurisdiction—which the district judge in fact did on remand. See *In re Cenco Inc. Securities Litigation*, 601 F. Supp. 336, 342-44 (N.D. Ill. 1984).

Second, and more important, the statute of limitations has run on the pendent claim. This is a conventional reason against relinquishing pendent jurisdiction after dismissal of the main claim. See, e.g., *O'Brien v. Continental Illinois Nat'l Bank & Trust Co.*, 593 F.2d 54, 65 (7th Cir. 1979); *Joiner v. Diamond M Drilling Co.*, 677 F.2d 1035, 1043 (5th Cir. 1982). Ordinarily, however, it is not a reason in the federal courts of Illinois. An Illinois statute provides that a case dismissed by a federal court on jurisdictional grounds—and a relinquishment of pendent jurisdiction is jurisdictional—can be refiled within a year

in state court, and in the interim the statute of limitations will stop running. Ill. Rev. Stat. ch. 110, ¶ 13-217; see *Bernstein v. Lind-Waldock & Co.*, 738 F.2d 179, 188 (7th Cir. 1984). But this particular provision became effective in 1980, after this suit was brought. We know the provision would not be applied retroactively to revive a time-barred cause of action, see *Conner v. Copley Press, Inc.*, 99 Ill. 2d 382, 388, 459 N.E.2d 955, 957 (1984), but the plaintiffs' suit was not time-barred when the provision was enacted. Even if the new provision is applicable, however, another obstacle looms: the one-year period in an earlier but materially identical statute was held to begin running when the case was dismissed rather than when the dismissal was affirmed. See *Hupp v. Gray*, 73 Ill. 2d 78, 382 N.E.2d 1211 (1978). If this ruling applies to the current statute, as well it may, the period for filing suit in state court has long since run out.

Given these uncertainties, on remand the district judge should not dismiss the pendent claim unless the defendants agree to waive their statute of limitations defense in state court. See *Financial General Bankshares, Inc. v. Metzger*, 680 F.2d 768, 778 (D.C. Cir. 1982). This point is applicable, by the way, to all the defendants, not just the three who are the appellants. With regard to retention of a pendent claim in order to prevent the bar of the statute of limitations from falling, it does not matter when the main claim is dismissed; it certainly does not matter whether it is after trial (as in the case of the three guards) or after appeal (as in the case of the three officials who are the appellants).

We reverse the district judge's judgment for plaintiffs with directions to dismiss the federal claims with prejudice, but we also reverse the judgment insofar as it dismissed the pendent claim. The plaintiffs have lost their constitutional tort suit against the six defendants involved in this appeal but their common law tort suit against them remains alive. The case is remanded for further pro-

ceedings consistent with this opinion; no costs in this court.

REVERSED AND REMANDED.

A true Copy:
Teste:

Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

November 1, 1985

Before

Hon. RICHARD D. CUDAHY, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. LUTHER M. SWYGERT, *Senior Circuit Judge*

JEFFREY WATTS,

Plaintiff-Appellant, Cross-Appellee,

Nos. 84-2219 and 84-2290

vs.

JAMES LAURENT, Youth Supervisor II, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees, Cross-Appellants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 82 C 4593
Bernard M. Decker, *Judge.*

ORDER

On consideration of the petition for rehearing with suggestion for rehearing *in banc* filed by defendants-appellees, cross-appellants in the above-entitled cause on October 10, 1985, no judge in regular active service has requested a vote thereon, and all judges on the original panel have voted to deny a rehearing. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the aforesaid petition for rehearing be, and the same is hereby, DENIED.

(3)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 27 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. 85-1299

In The
Supreme Court of the United States
October Term, 1985

JAMES LAURENT, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

JEFFREY WATTS,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

DENNIS J. KELLOGG*
MICHAEL PARKER
105 West Madison Street
Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 782-6463

Attorneys for Respondent

*Counsel of Record

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 835-7427 Ext. 333

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

STATEMENT OF FACTS 1

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT 23

ARGUMENT 24

THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT AFFIRMANCE OF THE *WATTS* JURY VERDICT WAS CORRECT AND FOLLOWED THE WELL-ESTABLISHED LIABILITY STANDARD OF OF DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE 24

A. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT *WATTS* DECISION IS ENTIRELY CONSISTENT WITH *DUCKWORTH* AND THE *DANIELS* AND *DAVIDSON* DECISIONS 24

B. THE DECISIONS OF THIS COURT AND LOWER COURTS HAVE SET AND FOLLOWED THE REQUIREMENT THAT THERE MUST BE DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO PLAINTIFF'S EIGHTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS IN ORDER FOR LIABILITY TO ATTACH 27

CONCLUSIONS 29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Pages

CASES:

Brancomb v. Brewer, 669 F.2d 1297 (8th Cir., 1982) 27

Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1967) 27

Freeman v. Franzen, 695 F.2d 485 (7th Cir., 1982) 28

Little v. Walker, 552 F.2d 193 (7th Cir., 1977) 27

Redmond v. Baxley, 475 F. Supp. 1111 (E. D. Mich., 1979) 28

Smith v. Wade, 461 U.S. 30 (1983) 28

RULE CITED:

Rules of the Supreme Court 17 (.1[a]) 24

STATEMENT OF FACTS*

JEFFREY WATTS, the Plaintiff herein, brought the instant action to recover damages for grevious injury sustained by him during his residence at the Illinois Youth Facility at St. Charles. While a resident he was attacked by a larger resident named DERRICK GREAVES consistent with the threats GREAVES made on at least four occasions. JEFFREY came to St. Charles after he was convicted of a crime which was the subject of a nondisclosure order (Tr. 5,6) and he remained a resident at St. Charles for approximately two years. He was one of 300-400 students confined therein. (Tr. 67).

The testimony established that JEFFREY was born on June 6, 1966 and was 17 years old at the time of trial. He resides in Chicago with his mother, stepfather, his three brothers and his sister. He was a good boy in his family, helping to care for his aged grandmother who was an invalid confined to a wheelchair. JEFFREY always lived with his mother and helped to take care of younger brothers and sisters. (Tr. 65,66).

JEFFREY was sentenced to a term of confinement at St. Charles at the age of 15. He stayed there approximately two years. He was never a gang member. (Tr. 67,114). Upon entering St. Charles he weighed about 120 pounds and stood 5'3" tall. (Tr. 73). He was approached by many different residents and asked to become a gang member. (Tr. 72).

During the two years he was a resident at St. Charles, there were many gangs in existence and active in the fa-

---

* This presentation fairly and accurately portrays the facts presented at trial.

cility. (Tr. 70). There was no objection by counsel for the Defense to any of such testimony concerning gangs. JEFFREY was aware only of some of the gangs at St. Charles. He named gangs such as the "Black Gangster Disciples, Vice Lords, Simon City Rollers, Latin Kings, Insane Unknowns, GBO's, YBO's, Gaylords, Saints, and other names" that he could not recall at the time of testifying. (Tr. 70). He was familiar with approximately nine gangs. He was never a gang member (Tr. 116).

During the period between October, 1981-January, 1982 a good eighty percent of the residents at St. Charles belonged to a gang. (Tr. 71). Quite a few of the gang members approached JEFFREY a couple of times and asked him to become a gang member. (Tr. 72). He did not join any gangs. (Tr. 67,114).

JEFFREY testified that he first came to know DERRICK GREAVES, the youth who attacked him, after GREAVES came to St. Charles from Valley View, another youth offender penal institution. There was a great disparity in height and weight; GREAVES was about 5'8" and weighed 155 and JEFFREY was about 5'3" and weighed about 120. In fact, GREAVES was known to the other residents as "Moose". (Tr. 73). GREAVES saw JEFFREY as a threat to his authority as a gang chief and attempted to bully JEFFREY and others whenever possible. (Tr. 83). JEFFREY stood up to GREAVES despite the vast disparity in size and weight which enraged Greaves all the more. JEFFREY was not afraid to fight GREAVES in a fair fight but knew he had to watch his back against him. (Tr. 116).

Prior to the attack of January 22, 1982 GREAVES threatened JEFFREY on at least four occasions in the

presence of the named Defendants. One threat took place about three weeks before January 22, 1982 and involved DERRICK GREAVES, CARMELLO SANTIAGO, CARLOS RIVERA and TORONTO BROOKS. (Tr. 74). JEFFREY was in Pierce Cottage, where he was assigned, and was playing cards with GREAVES and others. GREAVES then apparently became enraged and accused JEFFREY of cheating and threatened to "kick [his] ass if he found out [he] was cheating." GREAVES stated further that JEFFREY was lucky he was a shorty and that one day he was going to excuse that and fight him. (Tr. 76). At that time GERI CEJKA was on duty at the Pierce Cottage recreation area. (Tr. 76). She worked a regular daily shift at the cottage in her capacity as a security officer. (Tr. 89,90).

JEFFREY was threatened on a second occasion by GREAVES in the presence of the named Defendants. At that time he was lining up for breakfast outside of Pierce Cottage. GREAVES attempted to bully JEFFREY out of first spot in the breakfast line. GREAVES said at that time that he "runs the line" and, therefore, "goes first." He then stated, in his role as gang chief and bully, that he goes first because "this is his cottage" and he "runs the cottage." When JEFFREY refused to let GREAVES walk in front of him, GREAVES told him, "you're lucky you're a shorty and one day you're going to get yours." (Tr. 78).

At that particular time, ALETHA BROWN and STEVEN VAN JOSKE were present. (Tr. 78). They, like GERI CEJKA worked regular daily shifts in their capacities as security officers. They were responsible for monitoring, supervising, and controlling the inmate population at St. Charles.

A third occasion on which GREAVES threatened JEFFREY occurred at about 7:00 p.m. after the residents took their showers. JEFFREY was playing pool at that time when GREAVES grabbed a ball and tried to cheat him. GREAVES denied cheating, and when JEFFREY attempted to correct the game GREAVES came up to him and stated, "I'm going to smash you, punk, you keep on bothering me. You keep on getting on my nerves, I'm going to smash you." At that point GREAVES was in his face and students pulled them apart. The staff personnel sent GREAVES and JEFFREY to their rooms. (Tr. 80).

A fourth occasion during which GREAVES threatened JEFFREY took place one month before the attack outside the "old dining room" in the presence of JAMES LAURENT and STEVEN VAN JOSKE. The students were lining up to go into the cottage. JEFFREY was talking to a resident named JAMES BROWN, whom GREAVES did not like. GREAVES approached BROWN and JEFFREY and accused them of talking about him. JEFFREY denied it. GREAVES then proceeded to make faces at him and said, "Well, let me find you talking about me," and other comments of such nature. GREAVES stated, "Boy, one day," and other threatening comments to JEFFREY. (Tr. 19).

JEFFREY testified that there were further threats by GREAVES to other residents; GREAVES was a bully and picked on the others. (Tr. 83). He was transferred to St. Charles from Valley View because he was a disciplinary problem. (Tr. 82).

Concerning Defendant ALTHEA BROWN, JEFFREY testified she was a Youth Supervisor working from 6:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. five days per week. On and before

January 22, 1982, ALTHEA BROWN was assigned to Pierce Cottage where JEFFREY was a resident. Her job duties included security, custody and control of the residents. She awakened them in the mornings, gave them time to wash up, and then called them to line up to go to breakfast at the dining hall. ALTHEA BROWN was in direct contact with the residents of Pierce Cottage up to four hours per day, five days per week. (Tr. 84).

JEFFREY testified that Ms. Brown spoke with the Pierce Cottage residents about her son. Specifically, JEFFREY heard ALTHEA BROWN tell DERRICK GREAVES "hello" from her son, who was in the same gang together with GREAVES. (Tr. 85, 86). He also testified that ALTHEA BROWN was on duty during the times that DERRICK GREAVES threatened him and that threats were made in her presence. (Tr. 87).

Concerning Defendant STEVEN VAN JOSKE, JEFFREY testified that he was a Youth Supervisor working from 6:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. on the same daily shift as ALTHEA BROWN. STEVEN VAN JOSKE knew DERRICK GREAVES. GREAVES threatened JEFFREY when STEVEN VAN JOSKE was on duty and "if it wasn't in his presence, it should have been." (Tr. 88).

Concerning Defendant JAMES LAURENT, JEFFREY testified that he was a Youth Supervisor working from 6:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. on the same shift as ALTHEA BROWN and STEVEN VAN JOSKE. He was on duty when JEFFREY was threatened and was present when GREAVES threatened JEFFREY outside of the "old dining room." (Tr. 89).

Concerning Defendant GERI CEJKA testified that she was a Youth Supervisor who worked the 2:00 - 10:00

P.M. shift every day. JEFFREY complained to GERI CEJKA about GREAVES. He complained the day on which GREAVES threatened him while at Pierce Cottage. Both GREAVES and JEFFREY were given room time. (Tr. 90).

On January 22, 1982, after JEFFREY had been threatened by GREAVES on at least four occasions, JEFFREY was attacked and tackled by GREAVES which caused his severe injury to his hip. His cottage finished lunch at the usual time, 12:00. The weather was cold and snowing. The residents in the cottage lined up for the count and to walk back to the cottage. After the count, the students asked permission to run across the field to Pierce Cottage. In violation of rules, ALTHEA BROWN gave them permission. Everyone then began running. (Tr. 95, 96).

JEFFREY had school books in his hands, having come from class prior to lunch. He recalled running back to the cottage when DERRICK GREAVES came up behind him and tackled him with a bear hug, and fell on top of him. (Tr. 96). At that time, GREAVES was much taller and heavier than JEFFREY. When he got up, GREAVES growled and walked away as though he had done something "big". (Tr. 96).

JEFFREY was on the ground hollering in pain, screaming about the pain in his leg. He yelled out, "my leg," and he refused to be moved because of the pain. STEVEN VAN JOSKE and ALTHEA BROWN then arrived on the scene and asked if he was hurt. VAN JOSKE then took the other students to Pierce Cottage and ALTHEA BROWN radioed for the St. Charles Security Officers. Some of the students then picked JEFF-

REY up and carried him to the hospital on the grounds. (Tr. 98).

While in the on grounds hospital, JEFFREY received treatment from the nurse consisting of pillows under his leg. (Tr. 99). He was then taken to the emergency room at Elgin Hospital. The treatment at that facility included x-rays and injections for the pain. (Tr. 100). JEFFREY was then transferred to the University of Illinois Hospital where he was treated by Dr. HANLON. (Tr. 285). On admission he received pain injections every two hours. Further, he underwent surgery for internal fixation of the fracture site and insertion of Knowles pins. (Tr. 101, 286).

JEFFREY was an inpatient at the University of Illinois for approximately three weeks. He was confined to his bed with Buck traction for one and a half weeks. "Buck Traction" consisted of a bootlike fixation with a weight on the end to keep the foot immobile and aligned. He was receiving pain killing medication throughout his stay at the University of Illinois Hospital. He was eventually permitted to hobble around on crutches. (Tr. 102).

After discharge from the University of Illinois, JEFFREY was transported back to St. Charles and became an inpatient in the on grounds hospital. He was an inpatient at St. Charles for an additional two weeks. His treatment consisted of confinement to his bed with limited ambulation on crutches. He received medication three times per day. (Tr. 103).

After discharge from the on grounds hospital, JEFFREY was restricted in many ways. He could not walk to the dining room but had to be driven in a van. He was not allowed to participate in sports. He remained on

crutches for ambulation for approximately four weeks after discharge. (Tr. 103).

Every month, JEFFREY returned to the University of Illinois for checkups. He was reevaluated during the period February through November of 1982. Eventually he was readmitted to the University of Illinois to have the Knowles pins (internal fixation) removed. At that time he remained an inpatient for two and a half weeks. (Tr. 104). Following discharge, the medication and limitation on his daily activities continued. He was receiving Indocin (500 mg.) for pain. He was restricted to minimal daily activities.

As of February of 1984, JEFFREY was unable to raise his left knee as a result of his injury. He was able to raise his right knee but could not bend his right hip. He was able to tie his right shoe but not his left shoe. He was unable to sit normally in a chair and to slouch over on his right hip. He was unable to run up and down a court to play basketball. When he tried to play sports, he stated that, "mentally, it's better that I don't because it just kind of gets me down sometimes." (Tr. 106).

Since his last discharge from the University of Illinois JEFFREYs conditioned worsened. Although he has more movement in his leg then and was able to walk better. He has a bad case of arthritis of the hip and notices pain merely after standing up for a while. His pain medication was discontinued because of unwanted side effects. His doctor told him he would never be able to walk straight again. (Tr. 105,107).

JEFFREY was refused employment at Kentucky Fried Chicken because of his disability. He wanted to work there in October of 1983, but was denied employment

because the manager would not permit him to lift heavy things, explaining that the firm would not let him take that kind of risk where JEFFREY's leg was so badly injured. JEFFREY also attempted to gain other employment. (Tr. 109).

With respect to DERRICK GREAVES, JEFFREY testified that he was not "actually scared" but that he "had to watch [his] back against him and other residents." He testified that he was running at the time of the attack with his school books in hand. He wanted to get back to the cottage to write his aunt a letter, and he was running mainly because of the cold weather. He spoke with GERI CEJKA and RAY YOUNG, a counselor, about DERRICK GREAVES. He never told the on grounds hospital nurse that he had slipped or fallen on ice. (Tr. 111).

On cross-examination, counsel for the Defendants brought out that JEFFREY was asked to join the Vice Lords gang the very day of his arrival at St. Charles. He rejected that attempt by gang members to recruit him. He stated that the staff member of Buchanon Cottage was present, but the staff member was not a named defendant. (Tr. 116).

JEFFREY could not recall the exact time or date he was next approached regarding gang membership, but he know he had been "approached with it a couple of times." He turned them down, and some of them "used to talk and try to whip their little influence on me." He had a couple of fights with a few of them. (Tr. 115,116).

JEFFREY was not afraid of fighting DERRICK GREAVES in a fair fight, but he knew he had to watch his back against him. (Tr. 116).

As to the threat by DERRICK GREAVES in the recreation room, JEFFREY was cross-examined regarding Ms. CEJKA's presence. The following exchange took place:

By Ms. Black:

Q. Do you know whether she heard what was going on?

A. I see it this way: she should have heard.

Ms. Black: Your Honor, I ask that that be stricken.

Mr. Kellogg: Judge, she is asking him for his opinion. I think he can tell what his opinion is.

The Court: "Should have heard"—what do you mean by that? She was in the room someplace?

The Witness: She was in the recreation room.

This testimony established that GERI CEJKA was in the recreation room. If she was in the recreation room, she could have heard GREAVES threaten JEFFREY. She could have heard GREAVES say that he would "kick [JEFFREY's] ass", and that "[he] is lucky that [he's] a shorty". (Tr. 76).

As to the threat which occurred outside of the Pierce Cottage while the residents were lining up for breakfast, JEFFREY testified as follows on cross-examination:

By Ms. Black:

Q. You said that Ms. BROWN and Mr. VAN JOSKE were there?

A. Yes, they were. (Tr. 20).

This testimony establishes that Ms. BROWN and Mr. VAN JOSKE were in the presence of DERRICK GREAVES and JEFFREY at the time the threats were

made. If they were present, they could have heard GREAVES threaten JEFFREY. They could have heard GREAVES say that he "runs the line, he goes first", that he "goes first because this is his cottage, he runs this cottage", and that "you're lucky you're a shorty, and one day you're going to get yours." (Tr. 78).

As to the threat which occurred at the cottage near the pool tables, JEFFREY testified as follows on cross-examination:

By Ms. Black:

Q. You told this to Ms. CEJKA, didn't you?

A. She seen the incident.

* * *

Q. And you talked to Ms. CEJKA about the incident, didn't you?

A. Yes, we talked. (Tr. 123).

This testimony establishes that GERI CEJKA was present and saw the incident in question. JEFFREY even spoke to her about it. Having seen the incident, Ms. CEJKA could have also heard the threat to JEFFREY at that time. She could have seen the students come between them and pull them apart. She could have heard GREAVES say, "I'm going to smash you, punk, you keep bothering me. You keep getting on my nerves, I'm going to smash you." (Tr. 79).

As to the threat which occurred while the students were outside of the old dining room waiting to go in and eat, JEFFREY testified as follows on cross-examination:

By Ms. Black:

Q. And where exactly was Mr. LAURENT when DERRICK GREAVES allegedly threatened you?

A. Well, he was by a tree talking to other students, because then Mr. VAN JOSKE had went in the hospital with the medication students.

Q. So Mr. VAN JOSKE wasn't there when DERRICK GREAVES allegedly threatened you?

A. I don't know if he had come out or not, but I know before the threat he did go take the students in for medication.

Q. And Mr. LAURENT was talking to some other students, is that correct?

A. Yes, he was.

Q. And how far away was he from you?

A. He wasn't that far away.

* * *

Q. Now, after you had this last threat with DERRICK GREAVES, did you tell Mr. LAURENT about it?

A. Mr. LAURENT knew how DERRICK GREAVES was.

Q. Answer the question. Did you tell Mr. LAURENT about it?

A. He was there.

Q. Did you tell Mr. LAURENT about it?

A. He heard the incident.

Q. Did you tell Mr. LAURENT about it?

A. I didn't have to tell him because he was right there. (Tr. 126,127).

This testimony establishes that JAMES LAURENT was present, saw and heard the incident in question. He certainly could have seen GREAVES make "faces" at JEFFREY and say, "Boy, one day", and stuff like that. (Tr. 82).

JEFFREY testified further that when it was cold out the staff asked whether the students could run across the field to the cottage rather than take the road. Some staff members said yes and some said no. ALTHEA BROWN and JAMES LAURENT permitted the students to run across the field a couple of times prior to January 22, 1982, despite the rule against such running. (Tr. 129.140). There was no objection to such testimony.

On rebuttal, JEFFREY testified when he was brought to the on grounds hospital he was accompanied by other students. When they brought him in to Nurse HOYNE the students were saying, "he slipped on the ice." (Tr. 479). JEFFREY did not tell Nurse HOYNE that he slipped on the road. (Tr. 480). JEFFREY further testified that the time when he would normally go to the gymnasium on Saturday mornings GERI CEJKA was not working. (Tr. 482). JEFFREY further testified that his mother visited him around Thanksgiving Day in 1981 and at least one time thereafter when she brought him a new television set for a Christmas present. Based on what the testimony was, JEFFREY knew those visits were not reported on the visitation record. (Tr. 484-485).

Testimony of Charlene Moss

Ms. CHARLENE MOSS, JEFFREY's mother, testified that she was remarried in March of 1981 and that was why her name was no longer "WATTS". She had been employed for thirteen years at the Chicago Post Office. JEFFREY was living with her at home following his release from St. Charles. Around the house JEFFREY helped his mother care for the babies and his invalid grandmother. (Tr. 144,145).

Prior to January 22, 1982, JEFFREY was in perfect health. He liked to play many sports including football, basketball, and hockey and he often went to play those sports at the Humboldt Park Fieldhouse. After the accident JEFFREY could no longer play sports because of his leg. He could not get around as he once did. He no longer went dancing and had trouble climbing steps. (Tr. 145).

During JEFFREY's term at St. Charles, Ms. MOSS had the opportunity to visit him on five or six occasions. JEFFREY had been in fights out there and explained that he was just trying to defend himself. Ms. MOSS spoke with a Mr. AGEE on the telephone who identified himself as JEFFREY's counselor. On her visits to the institution she noticed the residents using gang hand signals to signify gang membership. The staff member who took the pass was there at that time. Ms. MOSS could not remember his name. (Tr. 146-148).

Testimony of Derrick Greaves

DERRICK GREAVES, JEFFREY's assailant, appeared and testified that he was convicted of a crime and sentenced to the Department of Corrections for Youth Offenders. He was first sent to St. Charles on September 1, 1981 and then he was briefly sent to the Valley View Institution. He remained there for three weeks and returned to St. Charles. He was assigned to Pierce Cottage. While at Valley View, GREAVES was a gang chief for the Black Gangster Disciples. He left Valley View because of "behavior problems" and he was in "a number of fights." (Tr. 182).

Prior to January 22, 1982, GREAVES testified that he ran across the field from the dining hall to the cottage on 2 occasions. He was impeached on that point from his discovery deposition and further on the point that JAMES LAURENT had given the students permission to run. (Tr. 189). Conveniently at the trial, he was unable to remember if there were staff members present on the occasions he ran across the field. He was unable to remember if any of the defendants seated at the table were present on the occasions he ran across the field. (Tr. 185). He had spoken to counsel for the defense prior to testifying. (Tr. 176).

On January 22, 1982 GREAVES recalled that he had lined up to go to the cottage after lunch. Some residents asked if they could run across the field and the staff said "yeah." As to the contact with JEFFREY, GREAVES testified, "Somebody was behind me and I—looked back in front of me and I my right knee hit his left hip and he went down." (Tr. 185). He testified further that, "JEFFREY WATTS cut in front of me. JEFFREY WATTS went down and I stumbled over him. I got up." (Tr. 187).

GREAVES testified that he did not remember and did not recall whether ALTHEA BROWN had a son about his age. (Tr. 186). He could not recall that he made three statements for the administration at St. Charles concerning the incident of January 22, 1982. (Tr. 190). He later admitted making each statement. (Tr. 190-192).

GREAVES testified that he never threatened JEFFREY prior to January 22, 1982. He later admitted that he and JEFFREY had a "slight confrontation." He described that and indicated, JEFF WATTS was messing

with some of our folks and they came back to me and they told me what was going on and they told me they were going to move out on JEFF WATTS." (Tr. 193).

GREAVES testified that he was aware of the following gangs at St. Charles: Latin Kings, Vice Lords, Disciples, Simon City Rollers and Blackstone Rangers. He then later admitted that there were probably more than 15 gangs at St. Charles. He further testified that the gang he belonged to, the Black Gangster Disciples, tried to recruit nongang members. (Tr. 200).

At the time of the trial, GREAVES was six feet tall and weighed 185 pounds. (Tr. 202). In January of 1982 GREAVES was about 5'8" or 5'9" and weighed about 175 pounds. (Tr. 205). He had played football before and knew how to tackle an opponent "and bring him down." (Tr. 203). GREAVES was involved with gangs at St. Charles before February of 1982. He had weekly gang meetings at St. Charles in Room 30, which was the laundry room. His gang met every Monday in the afternoon for seven minutes. (Tr. 209).

Certain additional testimony was adduced by way of deposition. On page 59 of his deposition, GREAVES testified:

Q. Did he ever accuse you of maliciously and deliberately tackling him, attempting to hurt him or anything to that effect?

A. Yes.

Q. When?

A. After his leg was broke, he was back in the cottage.

Q. This was after he got out of the hospital?

A. Yes. (Tr. 465).

Testimony of Geri Cejka

GERI CEJKA was called as an adverse witness and testified that she had been employed at St. Charles for 3½ years as a youth supervisor. Her duties included the security, custody, and the control of the boys in her custody. She was in close contact with the boys on a daily basis. She denied hearing any threats toward JEFFREY by GREAVES. She admitted, however, that GREAVES played the role of a "heavy" and that he was a heavy from the time he first arrived at Pierce Cottage until January 22, 1982. She further admitted that she wrote a memo after January 22, 1982 which she hoped would result in GREAVES' transfer from Pierce Cottage. Copies of that memo were directed to BARRY STEELE*, among others. (Tr. 222,224).

Testimony of Althea Brown

ALTHEA BROWN was called as an adverse witness and testified that she had been employed at St. Charles for three years as a youth supervisor. She spent 3½ hours per day in direct contact with the students. However, she denied any knowledge of gang activity at St. Charles. She further denied ever having given the students permission to run across the field to the cottage from the dining hall. (Tr. 236,237).

With respect to the incident in question, ALTHEA BROWN testified that she and STEVEN VAN JOSKE were counting the students after lunch when someone asked if he could run across the field. ALTHEA BROWN

---

* A Defendant dismissed by the trial judge whose decision was affirmed by the Seventh Circuit.

testified that she said, "No," but that "half of the students had ran." She further stated that she saw "JEFFREY slip down and DERRICK GREAVES fell over him." She was about a "city block" away. (Tr. 240,241).

ALTHEA BROWN denied that her son knew DERRICK GREAVES. She denied that DERRICK threatened JEFFREY. She denied having knowledge of any gang activity at St. Charles. (Tr. 242,243).

Testimony of Steven Van Joske

STEVEN VAN JOSKE was called as an adverse witness and testified that he had been employed at St. Charles as a youth supervisor for three years. In December of 1981 he worked the 6:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. shift. He described his duties in general as "to secure and supervise the youths through their daily routines." He testified that "any" of the defendants could attend weekly staffing meetings wherein the behavior of students would be discussed. Student behavior was the subject of record keeping in a daily logbook and that logbook was available to any defendant (staff member) to review. (Tr. 247).

STEVEN VAN JOSKE denied that there was gang activity at the St. Charles facility. He testified that, "gang meetings, gang signs, recruiting, there is none at the facility." However, he then admitted that if there was gang activity it would be written up and the student involved would be sent to Roosevelt solitary confinement. (Tr. 248). STEVEN VAN JOSKE also testified that he had no knowledge whether DERRICK GREAVES was a gang chief prior to January 22, 1982. He admitted that JEFFREY and DERRICK GREAVES "might" have argued

prior to such time. He further admitted that there were constant arguments and occasional fighting. (Tr. 251).

With respect to the incident in question, STEVEN VAN JOSKE testified that he and ALTHEA BROWN were counting students after lunch when some students asked if they could run across the field. ALTHEA BROWN said they could not as did Mr. VAN JOSKE. JEFFREY was seen to go over a little incline and DERRICK GREAVES was seen running behind him. The next thing he saw was JEFFREY on the ground. He denied seeing JEFFREY fall or any contact between GREAVES and JEFFREY. (Tr. 254).

On direct examination, in the defendant's case in chief, STEVEN VAN JOSKE testified that he would probably have to appear at a hearing if a youth under his custody was injured while he was on the job. The Board of Inquiry would probably investigate such an injury and then give recommendations to Mr. VAN JOSKE. The Superintendent would also give a recommendation. (Tr. 420).

Testimony of James Laurent

JAMES LAURENT was called as an adverse witness and testified that he had been employed at St. Charles for almost ten years. He did not know of any gang activity, however. He denied that he ever permitted students to run across the field to or from the dining hall. He denied that DERRICK GREAVES ever threatened anyone in his presence. (Tr. 259,260).

Testimony of Dr. Sean Hanlon

Dr. HANLON testified that he received his M.D. degree at the University of Illinois and was presently in his

residency training with a specialty in orthopedic surgery. (Tr. 285). He had occasion to treat JEFFREY after his admission to the University of Illinois Hospital on January 22, 1982. (Tr. 286).

While at the hospital, JEFFREY underwent open reduction and internal fixation for a fracture of the left hip. Metallic pins were used to secure fixation in the various bony fragments. (Tr. 287). The ball portion of the femur was dislocated from the joint and was resting in the buttock muscle. The bone was brought back into alignment and the fracture was pinned in a procedure that took about two or three hours. (Tr. 288). JEFFREY was hospitalized for about four weeks at that time. (Tr. 286).

In November of 1983 JEFFREY was readmitted to the University of Illinois at which time the metallic pins in his hip were removed. The pin removal took about one hour. After the surgery in January of 1982 as well as the surgery in November of 1983 JEFFREY underwent physical theropy for gait training, crutch walking, and muscle strengthening. (Tr. 289).

Dr. HANLON last examined the Plaintiff in February of 1984. He noted that JEFFREY walked with a marked limp. There was atrophy of the muscles of the left leg. There was a one inch shortening of the left leg as compared to the right. There was a severe restriction of motion in the left hip joint to approximately 25 percent of normal motion. (Tr. 289).

X-ray findings disclosed a marked collapse of the femoral head or ball part of the hip joint with secondary degenerative, arthritic changes. (Tr. 290). There was also avascular necrosis of the hip joint which defined as "an

interruption in the blood supply to the ball part of the hip joint resulting in death of the bone." Thereafter a collapse of the normal spherical shape of the head of the femur occurs. (Tr. 290).

In Dr. HANLON'S opinion, a tackle caused the injury. "Usually, this type of an injury is associated with a severe trauma such as a tackle." In Dr. HANLON'S opinion, JEFFREY will probably require further surgery. "A total joint replacement or an arthrodesis fusion of the hip are the two options for the patient in the future." (Tr. 293,294). In Dr. HANLON'S opinion, each procedure would necessitate about a month in the hospital, three to four weeks of hospitalization, a major surgical procedure. Approximately four to six months of recovery time would be required during which the patient would be limited to the use of crutches for walking and there would be a severe restriction on activities. (Tr. 294).

In Dr. HANLON'S opinion, each surgical procedure would result in permanent disability or restriction of function. JEFFREY would have to refrain from most recreational and any competitive athletics. Occupations involving heavy labor would be ill advised. There would be restrictions on everyday activities and the patient would be advised to take up more sedentary occupations. (Tr. 295).

As of the date of last examination, JEFFREY complained of mild pain. His main complaint was that he could not walk normally but must walk with a limp and that there was marked stiffness of the hip joint resulting in inability to bend at the waist and difficulty in sitting normally. (Tr. 295).

Testimony of Elaine Hoyne

Nurse ELAINE HOYNE testified that she was on duty at the on grounds hospital on the day JEFFREY was brought in. She stated that JEFFREY told her he fell on an "icy walk". She admitted on cross examination that several students came in with JEFFREY and that JEFFREY was crying and hollering. She also admitted that she did not chart everything said. (Tr. 308).

Following the testimony of Nurse HOYNE, the Plaintiff rested and the court entertained motions for directed verdicts on behalf of all Defendants. (Tr. 310,326). The Court denied the motion as to each remaining Defendant. (Tr. 335). The motions were renewed at the close of all the evidence and again denied. (Tr. 489). The case went to jury on February 15, 1984.

After approximately 1½ days of deliberation the jury returned verdicts against each Defendant in the amount of $40,000. The jury signed five separate verdict forms; one for each Defendant and each was for $40,000. There was no space on the verdict forms to assess a total amount of damages. The verdict forms were used without Plaintiff's approval. Plaintiff tendered standard general verdict forms which Judge DECKER refused. (Tr. 439).

Defendants had the opportunity to poll the jurors to correct any perceived ambiguity but chose not to do so. (Tr. 562). Instead, Defendants filed a motion to "clarify" the judgment pursuant to Rule 60. Judge DECKER allowed their motion and reduced the total amount of the judgment from $200,000 to $40,000.

It is from Judge DECKER'S allowance of the motion to "clarify" the judgment that Plaintiff appealed. A mo-

tion to supplement the record on appeal with the affidavits of two jurors, indicating they intended Plaintiff to receive no less than $200,000, was denied during the pendency of the appeal.

The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed Judge DECKER on each point below. The Court, however, offered to plaintiff the option of retrying the case on the issue of damages. With respect to that option the court stated:

> "Surprisingly, the most difficult issue in this case relates not to liability but to damages: the parties sharply dispute what amount of damages the jury actually awarded to plaintiff . . . . We are, therefore, in the interests of justice prepared to offer the plaintiff a new trial on damages, which he may accept or reject at a time and in a manner to be specified by the district court on remand."

Petitioners' Appendix pp. 23, 24.

Plaintiff filed a motion for rehearing adding two additional juror affidavits to the two juror affidavits previously filed. It was argued that all the jurors awarded a total of $200,000 in damages based on the juror affidavits and the affidavit of counsel for the plaintiff that the final two affidavits of the jury could not be procured. The plaintiff's cross petition for rehearing was denied on November 1, 1985.

———o———

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

A. The Seventh Circuit decision in *Watts* is consistent with its decision in *Duckworth* and this Court's decision in *Daniels v. Williams* and *Davidson v. Cannon* and this case is not a proper subject for consideration of Certiorari.

B. All factual and legal matters have been heard and argued or waived and this Petition merely delays resolution of this matter.

ARGUMENT

THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT AFFIRMANCE OF THE WATTS JURY VERDICT WAS CORRECT AND FOLLOWED THE WELL-ESTABLISHED LIABILITY STANDARDS OF DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE.

A. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT WATTS DECISION IS ENTIRELY CONSISTENT WITH DUCKWORTH AND THE DANIELS AND DAVIDSON DECISIONS.

The *DUCKWORTH V. FRANZEN* Nos. 85-1010, 85-1053, 85-1084, 85-1095, Dec. 17, 1985 decision is factually unrelated and hence legally distinguishable from the *Watts* decision. Initially, Justice Easterbrook was on the panel of both cases and could weed out any alleged contradictions. *Duckworth* concerns a fire in a prison transport bus — a products liability case with a § 1983 claim and pendent claims attached. But for the burning bus, there would be no issue of a § 1983 claim. The facts shown in the opinion did not reveal any prior notice to the prison officials about any propensity for fire or about dangerous conditions regarding safety. In fact, the case was remanded for determination on the pendent claim and the products liability action. Finally, even assuming a logical or legal inconsistency, this was at most a split within a circuit and not a proper subject for Writ of Certiorari under Rules of the Supreme Court, Rule 17.1(a).

The recent decisions of this Honorable Court in *Daniels v. Williams,* — U.S. —, 46 CCH Sup. Ct. Bull. 609 (1986), and *Davidson v. Cannon,* — U.S. — 46 CCH Sup. Ct. Bull. 627 (1986), determine and apply a negligence standard not applied in *Watts*. Initially, the Defendants are asking this Court to make a retroactive application of its decision to a case tried on February 13-17, 1984, and de-

cided by the Seventh Circuit on November 1, 1985. This might pose a problem if there was a logical inconsistency, but there is none. *Daniels* concerns the ***negligent*** leaving of a pillow on a stairway and the resulting injury to the prisoner. This Court decided the case on a motion for summary judgment and negligence was determined as a matter of law on the pleadings. This Court held that depending on a given constitutional right, merely negligent conduct may not be enough to state a claim. It was conceded that the action in *Daniels* was at most negligent, see ref. footnote #3, page 615. Therefore, there is no inconsistency between an agreed negligence action heard on a summary judgment by this Court and a jury determination of deliberate indifference in *Watts*.

In ***Davidson,*** there was also concession by both sets of parties that there was a ***negligent*** failure to protect the Plaintiff from another inmate; the district court sitting in bench trial also so determined. The Plaintiff had written a note to Assistant Superintendent Cannon regarding a threat he had received from a fellow-inmate, who later made good on the threat. Testimony at trial showed that when the prisoner had a serious problem, he made personal contact, and the note was written at least in part for corroboration should a fight later develop. The sitting judge expressly excluded a finding of deliberate or callous indifference to Plaintiff's needs.

Watts concerns a different fact situation. All of the threats to the Plaintiff were in the physical presence of the Defendants, which is more effective than a note, because there is no need to guess about immediacy or a particular meaning, and the message is not potentially impaired by the literacy of the writer. The weight to be given

to the threats to the Plaintiff then becomes a fact question for the jury. The jury evaluated live, sworn testimony of a parade of witnesses who were factually and causally connected to the setting of the attack, the attack itself, and the subsequent crippling injury to the Plaintiff. This injury resulted in a seventy-five per cent loss of function in the Plaintiff's left leg and hip. A crucial element was credibility.

Particularly important is the testimony of the assailant DERRICK GREAVES, presented at trial. GREAVES bragged of being a self-proclaimed gang chief at both the prior penal facility from which he was moved within months of the attack here, and at the youth facility in question here. GREAVES admitted to unsuccessful attempts to recruit the Plaintiff to gang membership, and GREAVES was the subject of a memo by one of the Defendants characterizing him as a "heavy" who dominated younger and smaller residents. In contrast to GREAVES' testimony, the Defendants who were in daily contact with the Plaintiff, assailant and others in the open dormitory and school-type setting denied the existence of gangs and any threats to the Plaintiff.

Finally, there were no evidentiary or jury instructions appealed to the Seventh Circuit. There was a hint that certain jury instructions may have been helpful to these Defendants:

> "The Defendants in this case do not challenge any of the instruction given at trial. They did not ask for an instruction requiring the victim to show that the Defendants knew that the victim was at greater or more clearly-defined risk than others in the institution, given the usual level of violence among inmates. They also did not ask for an instruction that

> would have made liability depend on some sort of notice or indication from the victim that there had been threats. We, of course, need not decide whether such instructions would have been appropriate, and do not make any suggestions with regard to them."
>
> Petitioners' Appendix p. 5, footnote 2.

The U.S. Supreme Court is not designed to sit as a nine-member jury panel, and should not re-weigh fact questions previously determined. The Defendants in *Watts* have not been asked to be guarantors of the Plaintiff's safety, but rather have been found liable under time-honored standards.

B. THE DECISIONS OF THIS COURT AND LOWER COURTS HAVE SET AND FOLLOWED THE WELL-ESTABLISHED REQUIREMENT THAT THERE MUST BE DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO PLAINTIFF'S EIGHTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS IN ORDER FOR LIABILITY TO ATTACH.

Several cases exemplify the law established in this type of case. See reference: *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1967) concerning a prisoner's serious illness or injury and medical needs; *Branchcomb v. Brewer*, 669 F 2d 1297 (8th Cir., 1982), concerning an attack on an inmate by another inmate; and *Little v. Walker*, 552 F 2d 193 (7th Cir., 1977) concerning gang-affiliated violence to fellow inmates. The *Little* case is particularly relevant here because Judge BERNARD DECKER, the trial judge in *Little*, was also the trial judge in *Watts*. The judge was particularly aware of the standard of deliberate indifference which was detailed in the opinion. Having been particularly familiar with the standard, it was naturally applied to the facts presented in *Watts*. Again,

no jury instruction has been appealed, so either the Defendants were satisfied with the instructions, or any alleged defect has been waived.

Another case significantly not included in the Defendants' brief is *Redmond v. Baxley* 475 F Supp 1111 (E.D. Mich., 1979). There, a failure to protect a prisoner gave rise to liability since the institutional employee should have realized the strong likelihood of an attack. Also worth noting is the jury award of $130,000 which was upheld for the homosexual rape and attendant injuries. There as in *Watts* the medical testimony was unrebutted by the Defendants.

An analogous case to *Watts* from the Seventh Circuit is presented in *Freeman v. Franzen,* 695 F 2d 485 (7th Cir., 1982). There, the Plaintiff-prisoner alleged he was beaten by several guards. Widely different stories were presented at trial concerning the facts. The jury weighed the credibility of the witnesses and decided the case for the Plaintiff, on both compensatory and punitive damages. The granting of judgment NOV for the one Defendant was reversed and the verdict reinstated.

A final similar case is *Smith v. Wade,* 461 U.S. 30 (1983). After a jury trial concerning an attack at a correctional facility for youthful offenders, the jury was expressly advised that they could not allow a recovery to the Plaintiff for simple negligence. After being given the appropriate instructions, the jury awarded for compensatory and punitive damages. Punitive damages not sought in *Watts* were affirmed by this Court.

The Defendants argue that the decision in *Watts* offends principles of federalism and the problems of sov-

ereign states in day-to-day operations of their prison facilities. The Plaintiff has not sought injunctive relief or policy determinations. Plaintiff has sought money damages for a constitutional deprivation of his Eighth Amendment rights resulting in a seventy-five per cent loss of function of his left leg and hip. The Plaintiff would rather have his leg back, and is not seeking to set governmental policy.

———o———

CONCLUSION

The *Watts* decision is consistent with the later decisions in *Duckworth* and *Daniels* and *Davidson.* This case is not a proper one for a Writ of Certiorari.

Wherefore, the Defendants' Petition for Writ of Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

DENNIS J. KELLOGG*
MICHAEL PARKER
105 West Madison Street
Suite 1500
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 782-6463

Attorneys for Respondent

*Counsel of Record

Dated: February 25, 1986

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 14 1986
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. 85-1299

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

JAMES LAURENT, Youth Supervisor II, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

JEFFREY WATTS,

Respondent.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit

REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

NEIL F. HARTIGAN
Attorney General, State of Illinois
ROMA JONES STEWART
Solicitor General, State of Illinois
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-3000
Attorneys for Petitioners

PATRICIA ROSEN *
Assistant Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-2570
* Counsel of Record

Printed by Authority of the State of Illinois (P.O. 33158—55—3-13-86)

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the District Court erred in denying defendants' motion for a judgment notwithstanding the verdict because no evidence of deliberate indifference was presented in this case.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
ARGUMENT:	
DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO PLAINTIFF'S NEED FOR PROTECTION WAS NOT PROVEN IN THIS CASE, SO THE COURT ERRED IN DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERDICT	1
CONCLUSION	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases	PAGE
Hallmark Industry v. Reynolds Metals Co., 489 F.2d 8 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 417 U.S. 932 (1973)	2
Hurd v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 734 F.2d 495 (10th Cir. 1984)	2
O'Neil v. W.R. Grace & Co., 410 F.2d 908 (5th Cir. 1969)	2
Redmond v. Baxley, 475 F. Supp. 1111 (E.D. Mich. 1979)	3
Ries v. Sanders, 34 F.R.D. 468 (N.D. Miss. 1964)	2
Whitley v. Albers, ___ U.S. ___, 46 S. Ct. Bull. (CCH) 1256 (1986)	3

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1985

JAMES LAURENT, Youth Supervisor II, et al.,

Petitioners,

vs.

JEFFREY WATTS,

Respondent.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit

REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

ARGUMENT

DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO PLAINTIFF'S NEED FOR PROTECTION WAS NOT PROVEN IN THIS CASE, SO THE COURT ERRED IN DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERDICT.

In his Brief in Opposition ("Br. Opp.") to the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this case, the plaintiff argues that defendants have "waived" (Br. Opp. at 23) the argument presented in their Petition, presumably because of their failure to request appropriate jury instructions (Br.

Opp. at 26-27). This argument completely misses the mark, since the presence of a fact question to be resolved by the jury would have been inconsistent with their request for the entry of a judgment notwithstanding the verdict ("JNOV"). Indeed, defendants' entire Petition before this Court has been predicated upon the absence of a factual issue to be resolved by the jury.

The standard for granting a JNOV is the same standard applied in granting a directed verdict. *Hallmark Industry v. Reynolds Metals Co.*, 489 F.2d 8, 13 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 417 U.S. 932 (1973); *O'Neil v. W.R. Grace & Co.*, 410 F.2d 908 (5th Cir. 1969). Such a motion presents a question of law as to whether all of the evidence (together with all reasonable inferences drawn therefrom), when viewed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, fails to prove a necessary element of the plaintiff's claim. *Ries v. Sanders*, 34 F.R.D. 468, 470 (N.D. Miss. 1964). If so, then the motion should be granted because no factual question is presented for the jury to decide. *Hurd v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 734 F.2d 495, 498-99 (10th Cir. 1984).

In the instant case, the precise question to be resolved by the District Court in ruling on the defendants' motions for a directed verdict and for judgment notwithstanding the verdict was whether the evidence could have permitted a jury to conclude that defendants were deliberately indifferent to plaintiff's need for protection. Defendants maintain that no such evidence was introduced in this case. At best, plaintiff has shown that defendants were negligent, which is not sufficient to sustain a verdict under the Eighth Amendment.

As this Court has recently emphasized, "[t]o be cruel and unusual punishment, conduct that does not purport to be punishment at all must involve more than ordinary

negligence." *Whitley v. Albers*, ____ U.S. ____, 46 S. Ct. Bull. (CCH) 1256 (1986). Unless the evidence, viewed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, will support an inference of deliberate, willful, or reckless conduct, "the case should not go to the jury." *Id.* at 1264. This was precisely the situation presented by the instant case where there was no evidence of willful or reckless behavior presented by the plaintiff.

The facts of the instant case contrast sharply with the facts of *Redmond v. Baxley*, 475 F. Supp. 1111 (E.D. Mich. 1979) (Br. Opp. at 28), where the prisoner yelled for help because he was approached by three other inmates desiring sex. Plaintiff and one other inmate testified that the defendant Baxley ignored the plea for help, "basically telling the plaintiff to take care of himself." 475 F. Supp. at 1114. A few hours later the three inmates approached plaintiff again, this time forcibly raping him. *Id.* Since the defendant had knowledge of an imminent threat to plaintiff's safety, defendant's failure to take some action to protect plaintiff was actionable under the Eighth Amendment.

No similar facts were presented in the instant case, where all of the alleged threats took place several weeks prior to the injury itself, and where such hostile comments were a common, everyday occurrence among prisoners at the St. Charles facility. There was no reason for defendants to suspect that a physical assault would occur as a result of the arguments between plaintiff and Derrick in the instant case.

Accordingly, no jury question was presented concerning the defendants' deliberate indifference because there was *no* evidence of deliberate indifference. Defendants are not asking this Court, nor did they ask the District Court or the Seventh Circuit, to reweigh the evidence or re-

assess the credibility of the witnesses. Rather, defendants simply assert that no fact question was presented because plaintiff failed to present any evidence which would support a verdict on one of the necessary elements of his claim—deliberate indifference. For this reason, defendants' motion for a JNOV should have been granted.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, petitioners respectfully pray that this Court grant their Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. Alternatively, petitioners pray that this Court summarily reverse the decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals imposing Eighth Amendment liability on these defendants, or vacate and remand this case for reconsideration in light of your recent decisions concerning the Eighth Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

NEIL F. HARTIGAN
Attorney General, State of Illinois

ROMA JONES STEWART
Solicitor General, State of Illinois

100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-3000

Attorneys for Petitioners

PATRICIA ROSEN *
Assistant Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 917-2570

* Counsel of Record